DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 901 IR 007 170

TITLE	School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials: Title II, ESEA. Strengthening Instruction in the Academic Subjects: Title III, NDEA. Annual Report, 1974.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	162p.; Some tables are minimally legible due to small type size; For related documents, see IR 007 166-171, IR 007 180-183 and ED 082 382, ED 086 215 and ED 101 467
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Education; Bibliographies; Educational Objectives; *Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditures; *Federal Programs; *Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Materials; Library Materials; Program Administration; Records (Forms); School Libraries; Tables (Data); Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title II; *National Defense Education Act Title III

ABSTRACT

This document contains the annual reports for two federal educational programs: Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA Title II) for FY 1974 and Title III of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA Title III) for FY 1973 and 1974. Derived from annual reports which were submitted by state educational agencies and other jurisdictions to the U.S. Office of Education, each report consists of a financial status report, showing expenditures by category during the previous fiscal year, and a performance report, which provides a comparison of actual accomplishments to established goals, supplies some statistical information, gives reasons why established goals could not be met, and other pertinent information. A bibliography of publications on the ESEA Title II Program and the financial status and performance report forms used in both programs for FY 1974 are included. Seventeen tables supply statistics for the ESEA Title II program relating to funds, number of professionals assigned, number of teachers and children participating, expenditures for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials; ten tables provide similar statistics for the NDEA Title III program, including equipment expenditures in its seven academic areas and loans granted during the fiscal year. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169901

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANNUAL REPORTS

Title II, ESEA

School Library Resources, Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials
Fiscal Year 1974

Title III, NDEA

Strengthening Instruction In The Academic Subjects
Fiscal Years 1973 - 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary
Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education
Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner

IR007170

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.--No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

I. ESEA Title II: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials

CONTENTS

PAGE

Section I. ESEA Title II; School Library Resources Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials

1. Introduction.. 1

2. State Administration of ESEA Title II................. 4

3. Participation of Children and Teachers and Utilization of Funds by Local Educational Agencies................ 6

4. Management Goals...................................... 9

5. Management Goals and Comprehensive Planning........... 14

6. Program Goals... 20

7. How the Relative Need Formulas Reflected Program Goals... 28

8. Achievement of Program Goals.......................... 34

9. Implementation of Goals in Title II Projects.. 41

10. Cumulative Impact of Title II of the Education of Public and Private School Children................... 51

Bibliography: Publications on the ESEA Title II Program................................ 65

Appendix: ESEA Title II Financial Status and Performance Report Forms, Fiscal Year 1974. 69

Tables:

Table 1. Funds available and funds expended for acquisition and State administration and percent of total expended for administration under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1973...... 76

Table 2. Funds available and funds expended for acquisition and State administration and percent of total expended for administration under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974...... 77

Table 3. Funds available and funds expended for State administration and for acquisitions under ESEA Title II programs: Fiscal Years 1966-76 78

Table 4. Number of State educational agency staff assigned to ESEA Title II programs, in fulltime equivalents: Fiscal Year 1974 79

Table 5. Number of professional and nonprofessional staff assigned to ESEA Title II programs in State educational agencies in fulltime equivalents: Fiscal Years 1966-74 80

Table 6. Number of public and private school children and teachers participating in ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974 81

Table 7. Number of public and private schools enrolling children participating in ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974 82

Table 8. Expenditures for instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools; costs of ordering, cataloging, processing and delivering materials; under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1973 83

Table 9. Costs of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in public elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1973 84

Table 10. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in public elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1973 85

Table 11. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974 86

Table 12. Expenditures for instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools; costs of ordering, cataloging, processing and delivering materials under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974 87

Table 13. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974.......................... 88

Table 14. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers under ESEA Title II programs: Fiscal Years 1966-74........... 89

Table 15. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in public elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974........................... 90

Table 16. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974.......................... 91

Table 17. Number of public elementary and secondary schools with and without school library/media center: Fiscal Year 1974........... 92

Section II. NDEA Title III: Strengthening Instruction in the Academic Subjects

1. Introduction... 94

2. State Administration of NDEA Title III............... 96

3. NDEA Title III Management Goals..................... 98

4. Management Goals and Comprehensive Planning.......... 102

5. Program Goals and Priorities......................... 105

6. Achievement of Program Goals......................... 110

7. Implementation of Goals in NDEA Title III Projects... 117

8. Cumulative Impact of NDEA Title III on Education..... 128

9. Loans to Private Nonprofit Elementary and Secondary Schools.................................... 132

Appendix: NDEA Title III Financial Status and Performance Report Forms, Fiscal Year 1974.................................. 134

Tables:

Table 1. Federal and State funds expended for State administration of NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1973.................................. 140

Table 2. Federal and State funds expended for State administration of NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974.................................. 141

Table 3. Number of State educational agency personnel assigned to NDEA Title III administration in fulltime equivalents: Fiscal Year 1973.. 142

Table 4. Number of State educational agency personnel assigned to NDEA Title III administration in fulltime equivalents: Fiscal Year 1974.. 143

Table 5. Source of funds and percent of total expenditures for acquisition of equipment and materials, audiovisual libraries, and minor remodeling under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1973.................................. 144

Table 6. Source of funds and percent of total expenditures for acquisition of equipment and materials, audiovisual libraries, and minor remodeling under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974.................................. 145

Table 7. Federal and State funds expended for equipment and materials in seven academic subject areas and for audiovisual libraries and minor remodeling under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1973.................................. 146

Table 8. Federal and State funds expended for equipment and materials in seven academic subject areas and for audiovisual libraries and minor remodeling under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974.......................... 147

Table 9. Loan to private nonprofit schools under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974............... 148

Table 10. Use of loans under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974.................................. 149

1. Introduction

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) as amended, provides direct Federal assistance for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Its purpose is to improve learning and teaching by making available high quality instructional materials to pupils and their teachers.

Up to three percent of the appropriation was set aside for allotment among American Samoa, Guam, The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, V.I., the Department of the Interior for children and teachers in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Department of Defense for children and teachers in overseas dependents' schools.

The balance of the appropriations was apportioned among the States and D.C. on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and private schools in each State in proportion to the national total of such children. States operate their programs under title II on the basis of State plans approved by the Commissioner of Education. State plans include assurances of: Administration of the program under relative need and selection criteria; equitable treatment of the private sector; maintenance of effort.

The authorizations and appropriations of the program up to and including fiscal year 1974 are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$100,000,000	$100,000,000
1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
1968	150,000,000	99,200,000
1969	162,000,000	50,000,000
1970	200,000,000	42,000,000
1971	200,000,000	80,000,000
1972	210,000,000	90,000,000
1973	220,000,000	100,000,000
1974	220,000,000	90,000,000

By fiscal year 1974, the ninth year of title II, certain patterns had emerged that would indicate the partial realization of the title's purpose: to improve teaching and learning through the provision of high quality school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials. This improvement was evidenced in a variety of ways, among which were reports of an increasing use of the interdisciplinary approach in course planning. The Bicentennial Year provided special motivation, in that States in various parts of the country reported studies in American Civilization which combined elements of history, literature, the arts and music, and social studies. Environmental education was another subject lending itself to across-the-barriers approach, in which ecology, weather, geology, soils study, and wildlife conservation were melded into a successful interdisciplinary curriculum.

Metric education, early childhood education and a continuing interest in reading programs shared the spotlight with mathematics in areas of emphasis requiring abundant provision of materials. Special groups of children were targeted for needed resources, i.e., children in rural or isolated areas, children with bilingual and bicultural backgrounds, children in institutions, and the gifted as well as the disadvantaged.

Overall, fiscal year 1974 would seem to indicate an increasing awareness on the part of the States for the need of long-range planning and a unification of funding programs to achieve better learning and teaching. Finally, the library/media center idea, a small dot on the horizon some 10 years ago, has grown in size and concept so that fiscal year 1974 saw it as an accepted goal to be strived for at all levels -- elementary and secondary -- and in public and private schools. With the establishment of improved media centers came an increasing demand for specialists to staff and organize them.

In the U.S. Office of Education, title II was administered during fiscal year 1974 in the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources. For program administration, States and other participating areas were divided into five regions of the United States as follows:

Northeast	Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.
Southeast	Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.
Upper-Midwest	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.
Mid-Continent	Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.
Western	Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, American Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Data in the report are derived from annual reports which are submitted by State educational agencies, and other jurisdictions to the U.S. Office of Education following the close of fiscal year 1974. The annual report consists of two parts:

> The Financial Status Report shows expenditures in the various categories during previous fiscal year.

> The Performance Report provides a comparison of actual accomplishments to established goals, provides some statistical information, gives reasons why established goals could not be met, and provides other pertinent information.

The forms are included in the appendix of this report. The examples from States cited to illustrate the various topics covered by the report are arranged in order by the geographic regions - Northeast, Southeast, Upper Midwest, Mid-Continent, Western. The report provides evidence that materials made available under Title II contributed to a great extent to innovations in instruction and to flexibility in meeting the needs of children and teachers in the process of education.

2. State Administration of ESEA Title II

Data on expenditures for State administration of title II in fiscal year 1973 were not provided in the annual report on the program for that year because these datawere not collected until 1974. For fiscal year 1973, $10 million of the $100 million appropriated was not released to State departments of education until January 1974. These data are included in this report as was similar information for fiscal year 1974.

Administration - Fiscal Year 1973

For administration of the ESEA title II program in fiscal year 1973, the proportion of the total allotment reported expended by the 50 States, American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Affairs, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was 3.75 percent (Table 1). The amount expended for administration ($3.7 million) is at a level only slightly higher than in previous years. Even with the increase, the amount expended for administration is at least $1 million less than the amount actually available. Although 16 States and areas expended all or nearly all of their full title II allotments, six States expended less than 10 percent of the allotment. The total proportion of the allotment expended (69.1 percent) is less than in any year since the beginning of the program.

P.L. 93-269, which authorized the obligation and expenditure of fiscal year 1973 funds through June 30, 1975, applied to the title II program. A total of $30.8 million (30.8 percent of the appropriation) was carried over from fiscal year 1973 for expenditure in fiscal year 1974 (Table 1, col. 8). The fact that some States did not report unpaid obligations as expenditures and the release of $10 million well after the end of fiscal year 1973 may account for the large amount reported carried over.

Administration - Fiscal Year 1974

For administration of the title II program in fiscal year 1974, the 50 States, D.C., American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, V.I., and the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported expenditures of $29 million, significantly less than the amount available for administration and a decrease from the amount expended in fiscal year 1973 (Table 2). Acquisitions expenditures totalled $74.1 million, with $16 million carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1975. A larger proportion of the total allotment (82.1 percent) was expended than in fiscal year 1973 when nearly 31 percent of the allotment was carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1974 (Table 3).

Title II Personnel in State Educational Agencies - Fiscal Year 1974

In fiscal year 1974, there were 276 positions (in full-time equivalents assigned to the administration of title II in State educational agencies (Table 4), almost the same number of staff as estimated for fiscal year 1973 (Table 5). The number of such staff assigned to title II declined in fiscal years 1969 and 1970 when the appropriation was sharply reduced and has never entirely regained the level reached in the early years of the program (Table 5).

Staff losses for supervisory personnel have been the most serious. Media and subject specialists or supervisors gave the program valuable support in such areas as project development, monitoring, technical assistance to local educational agency staff, inservice education activities, and revision of school media standards.

3. Participation of Children and Teachers and Utlization of Funds by Local Educational Agencies

Table 6 provides data on the number of children and teachers participating in the title II program in fiscal year 1974. Of the 45.6 million and 5.4 million children enrolled in public and private elementary and secondary schools respectively, 81.4 percent of all public school children and 71.1 percent of all private school children benefited from the program. The percentage of participation would be much higher if based on numbers of children enrolled in eligible schools. Eligible schools are those which provide elementary or secondary school education as provided under State law, not beyond grade 12, and which comply with the State compulsory attendance laws, or recognized by some other procedure customarily used in the State. Schools must also be in compliance with the Civil Rights Act. States reported that the participating children were enrolled in 74,480 public and 13,396 private elementary and secondary schools (Table 7). Over 1.7 million teachers participated in the program to the extent that their pupils had the use of instructional materials acquired under title II (Table 8). The figure does not represent the number of teachers who had the use of professional materials provided under the program.

Acquisitions - Fiscal Year 1973

In fiscal year 1973, 94.5 percent of the amount expended under title II was for the acquisition of instructional materials in the three eligible categories - school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. Of this amount $2.7 million went for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering materials, a decrease from fiscal year 1972 of about $500,000 (Table 8). Nine States - Ariz., Ark., Illi., Minn., Neb., Ohio, Ore., Utah, and Va. - Guam, American Samoa, and V.I., reported no expenditures for these services. For these and other States, much of the costs for these services may be reported as part of the cost of materials; however, State title II coordinators also report that much of the cost of ordering, processing, and cataloging materials is absorbed by local educational agencies.

Categories of Materials - Fiscal Year 1973

Table 9 provides data on the cost of the instructional materials in each of the three categories provided for loan to both public and private school children and teachers in fiscal year 1973. The amount expended for school library resources was $55.8 million, or 89 percent of the total expended for instructional materials. The proportion expended for textbooks is 2.05 percent, with the remaining 8.7 percent accounted for in the instructional materials category.

There was a significant increase in both the amounts and proportions of funds expended for textbooks, and other instructional materials over fiscal year 1973; however, 39 States or other areas expended no title II funds for textbooks and 26 spent no title II funds for other instructional materials.

The choices made by the States reflected priority needs for the three categories. P.R. and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have for several years utilized large amounts of title II funds for textbooks because of special linguistic problems and unusual need for textbooks.

The proportion of title II funds expended to provide instructional materials for the use of private school children (9.5 percent) is roughly the same proportion that private school children represent of the total elementary and secondary school population (Table 11). The proportion of funds expended to provide textbooks for the use of public school children (Table 10) is about the same proportion expended for the same purpose for private school children (Table 11); however, there are marked differences in the other two categories. Instructional materials purchased for the use of public school children are predominantly school library resources (Table 10) - books, audiovisual or other materials that are processed and organized - while those for the use of private school children (Table 11) are largely "other instructional materials" or materials that are not processed and organized.

Acquisitions - Fiscal Year 1974

The proportion of title II funds expended in fiscal year 1974 to provide instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools is almost 10 percent of the amount of title II funds spent for instructional materials (Table 12). Ten States and areas were unable to supply separate figures for expenditures for instructional materials for loan to private school children. Of the total expended for acquisitions (71.1 million), $2 million went for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering materials. This figure has decreased slightly for several years at a time when actual costs for these services has increased, an indication that the costs for these services are probably being absorbed by local educational agencies or that such costs are reported as part of the cost of the materials.

Categories of Acquisitions - Fiscal Year 1974

Table 13 provides data on the cost of the instructional materials in each of the three categories provided for loan to both public and private elementary and secondary school children and their teachers in fiscal year 1974. Since the beginning of the title II program, the largest proportion of acquisitions funds has been spent each year for school library resources (Table 14). This trend continues in fiscal year 1974. The amounts and proportions of the acquisitions funds expended for textbooks and other instructional materials declined slightly from those expended in previous years (Table 12). Only 13 States and P.R. expended title II funds for textbooks, however, 27 States and areas expended funds for "other instructional materials".

Tables 15 and 16 show the proportions expended in each of the three categories for public and private school children. Of interest is the fact that private school children are loaned a larger proportion of materials in the "other instructional materials" category - books, audiovisual materials, and other materials that are not organized and processed -than public school children.

Public school children are loaned a larger proportion of "school library resources" are the same types of materials - books, audiovisual materials, etc. - the difference being that school library resources are processed and organized for use and "other instructional materials" are not.

4. Management Goals

To administer Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, State educational agencies and local educational agencies formulate goals for the provision of school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. These goals, which provide a sense of broad direction for the program, take the form within each State of management goals for administration of the program.

Overall management goals identified by States for the Administration of ESEA Title II include all activities related to program management, from the development of a formula for the distribution of school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials among eligible children and teachers according to relative need, to a final reporting on the activities, expenditures and accomplishments within the State. Specific management goals include:

1. Determination of allocations for local educational agencies
2. Dissemination of information and application forms and materials
3. Review and approval of project applications
4. Provision of technical assistance to local educational agencies requesting help in such areas as assessment of needs; in planning, implementing and evaluating projects; and in budgeting and accounting
5. Monitoring approved projects through on-site visits and through the review of annual program reports, annual inventory summaries, annual audit reports and requests for reimbursement

Among the Northeastern States, Vermont reported a continuing experiment with its Co-Gram (Consolidated Grants Management), which combines into one application form requests for funds from ESEA Title I, II, III, and NDEA Title III, thus encouraging better program planning on the part of individual schools and districts. New Jersey reported processing 1231 applications in Fiscal Year 1974. This represented an increase of nine applications (all of which were for vocational schools) from the public school sector, and a decrease in the private sector participation because of the closing of several schools. Two additional State schools applied for inclusion in the program.

Most States reported conducting regional conferences to assist school personnel with project development. The Title II staff in the New York Education Department followed up its 10 regional workshops by conducting two special planning sessions with school personnel in New York City. Schools were urged to determined their own needs and goals, involving teachers and pupils in the processes of planning and selection; in the development of indepth materials collections in specific subject areas; and in the introduction of new media.

A problem reported in some States in the area of project administration is the monitoring of local projects. Mass. reported:

> Monitoring the basic grant program continues to be a central problem, since over 3,000 schools participate in the program. Modifying the basic grant program so as to make it more easily monitored does not seem a feasible alternative at this time. Schools should not be restricted in terms of selection since their needs vary so widely. To concentrate funds in communities where the need for materials is most dire would mean eliminating or withdrawing support from many other communities whose needs are nearly as great. Very few, if any, Mass. cities and towns could do easily without the expected annual ESEA title II grant.

Many States reported dissemination of information about the title II program as a significant management goal in fiscal year 1974. N.J. prepared a booklet on its special-purpose grants for those who would like to visit schools to observe special features of the media and instructional program or see model collections of media. Special directions and programs are outlined so that visitors can identify areas of particular interest. Several States referred to management goals related to the use of State advisory councils, established to assist with the development and revision of administrative policies for the title II program. For example, the N.J. Advisory Council continued its activities related to the special-purpose grants phase of the program and the N.Y. Advisory Council continued its study of the relative need formula.

In the Southeastern region, N.C. reported incorporating fiscal year 1974 goals for ESEA title II with the annual planning procedures of its Division of Education Media. D.C., which operates administratively as a State educational agency, adjusted title II management goals to conform the decentralization plan of the school system:

1. To include representatives from each of the six regions on the advisory committee for special-purpose grants

2. To achieve 100% representation from public and private schools -- preferably media specialists -- at all scheduled workshops where instructions are given on management procedures to be used in the program

3. To lend pragmatic assistance with proposal writing to schools having innovative instructional programs

Ky., in addition to the goals common to other States such as development of formulas for the allocation of funds to local educational agencies and provision of technical assistance for the improvement of project development and monitoring, listed coordination of the ESEA title II program with NDEA title III (equipment and minor remodeling) and the guidance, counseling, and testing portion of ESEA title III as a forerunner to the implementation of the proposed consolidation requirement.

Management goals identified by the Va. title II staff were:

1. To revise the program calendar and extend the time for the submission of claims for reimbursement, allow wiser use of funds in the use of reorders, substitutions, and cancellations

2. To review and revise the evaluation criteria for special-purpose grants in order to assess the impact of these funds on the instructional program

3. To correlate the direction of the title II program with its revised Standards of Quality, the plan of the Department of Education for upgrading and equalizing all aspects of Va.'s educational program.

W.V. had as a management goal for the ESEA title II office the improvement of the quality and efficiency of the program at both the State and local level. To realize this goal, the following specific objectives were listed:

1. All relative need applications will describe the educational need for which the funds will be spent

2. State priorities will be revised to exclude the acquisition of textbooks

3. The relative need formula will be revised to reflect more closely the actual need of each school for materials eligible for purchase with title II funds

4. All ESEA title II forms will be reviewed and revised

5. All obligations will be liquidated within the fiscal year. State education agency personnel will make on-site visits to assist in accomplishing this objective.

States in the Mid-Continent region also reflected a desire to tighten up and improve title II administration through their goals statements. Mont., for instance, formulated goals to develop improved procedures for selection, acquisition and use of materials, and to disseminate information on a continuing basis of opportunties provided by title II to strengthen teaching and learning. N.M. cited as a mangement goal the development and revision of its standards and criteria, while Okla. goals included dissemination of information to its private schools on the utilization of innovative materials as an aid to improving the teaching-learning process.

Cited in management goals for Tex. were maintenance of a program control system to insure compliance with grant conditions, regulations and State Board policies, and provision for adequate accounting information from initial grant negotiations to final financial report; provisions of assistance to local educational agencies in program implementation; development of an Instructional Resources System to coordinate acquisition and utilization of all instructional resources; and provision of leadership to the Regional Educational Service Centers in the acquisition and circulation of resources.

Utah reported the following management goals:

1. To promote a systems approach to planning and implementing the overall objectives of the program
2. To promote the integration of funds of title II, ESEA with other Federal and State funding programs having related purposes
3. To assist local education agencies in assessing and evaluating the status of their media programs and in determining their needs
4. To provide standards and evaluative instruments to assist in assessing current status and determining needs as an important aspect of local planning
5. To provide funds allotment data to administrators and fiscal officers of each local education agency, including eligibility status
6. To evaluate reimbursement claims and issue funding to eligible districts

In the States of the Upper Midwest, local educational agencies reported development of specific sub-goals under the umbrella goals formulated by State education agencies. Ill. among other management goals, included a continuing commitment to provide a quality media program through a management-by-objectives system. Iowa moved to revise the application forms for distribution among its 16 regional education media centers and to provide the centers with guidelines for submitting an annual inventory; including reporting title II materials removed from inventory. Three statewide meetings were held for title II State Advisory Council members, Sub-agency chairmen and Regional Educational Media Center personnel to discuss administrative procedures and problems and provide general information regarding the program. A uniform catalog of title II 16mm films available in all 16 regional educational media centers was produced and distributed. Efforts were made to coordinate title II funds with other Federal as well as State programs.

Neb. seemed to be following an increasingly popular trend among the States -- use of an Advisory Council in implementing and planning program change. Mich. prepared an administrative handbook for dissemination of new directions to local administrators, program coordinators, media specialists, and teachers.

Management goals in N. Dak. were:

1. Assist local school districts to develop programs to provide maximum benefits for every child and teacher, with particular emphasis towards acquisition of materials that upgrade the ability to read with comprehension

2. Encourage selection processes to strengthen total collections on recently produced materials

3. Prepare guidelines and forms necessary to implement the program and reimburse social educational agencies

4. Encourage the employment of qualified librarians

5. Encourage maximum cooperation between public schools, private schools in the title II program

6. Assist local administrators in the completion of application forms and provide all necessary information relative to title II program requirements through visitations, telephone communication or mailings

7. Encourage all school districts to participate in the program

The view from the Western region, as regards management goals, is quite similar to the areas described in the preceding paragraphs. Among Ore.'s management goals were revision of application forms to simplify procedures; the provision of technical assistance to local educational agencies; and the monitoring and evaluation of local projects to assure proper use of funds and to assure approved methods of record keeping. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, under whose jurisdiction there are 10 area offices serving 200 local educational agencies, combine on-site monitoring of title II with that for other Federal programs. Several management goals, i.e., meeting deadline dates for dissemination of project application planning allowances and receipt of completed project applications, could not be met as scheduled because of a delay in funding. Guam listed as priority management goals the provision of technical assistance to participating school libraries in an attempt to meet proper project application and preparation procedures, and the establishment of qualitative and quantitative standards for educational materials. Hawaii's reported management goals included enrichment and support of the curriculum through providing school library resources and other instructional materials, including audiovisual media. Hawaii also reported, revision and up-date of its State program.

In an effort to aid in the materials selection process, the State of Wash. had as a goal the preparation and dissemination of its title II publication, Selecting Learning Resources. This useful publication contains bibliographies of materials for basic collections, for guidance and counseling, vocational and career education, and for other specific subject areas.

5. Management Goals and Comprehensive Planning

Management goals used in the administration of title II are to be closely allied with the overall planning and strategy development used by State education agencies when establishing their priorities and goals. ESEA title II staff in State educational agencies encouraged local educational staff to plan media programs with effective coordination of funding from Federal, State and local sources. State priorities were used to plan title II projects for the improvement of instruction in target areas through the acquisition of appropriate media.

Under the basic grant program, school districts in Mass. have discretion in using ESEA title II funds for local curriculum priorities and areas. The special grant program, however, is intended to support State priority areas as well as local needs and priorities. The State priority areas supported in fiscal year 1974 under title II included special education (seven projects) and career education (16 projects) as well as subjects relatively new to the curriculum, e.g., women's studies, consumer education sex education, and introduction of the metric system.

One of N.H. management goals -- to organize school visits to assist local school personnel in assessing local needs relating to acquisition and use of title II resources -- supports a State goal concerning school visits for the purpose of assisting in the improvement of instruction and encouraging local evaluation. Forty visits were coordinated with title II activities in fiscal year 1974. Needs were identified for program, staff, services, and facilities in the following curriculum areas: health, physical education, elementary safety education, reading, and environmental education. The environmental education projects, usually interdisciplinary in nature, featured ecology, weather, geology, soils, wildlife, and plants of various areas of the State. Title II staff in N.H. have cooperated in the development of two booklets providing information on environmental education programs, with emphasis on access to useful instructional media in the field. Career education has also offered States opportunities to develop management goals for title II with State planning and leadership activities. The introduction into preparation, entry and advancement, created a demand for media describing new and traditional careers, and providing nonrestrictive occupational models for girls. Career education projects funded under title II have offered teachers the opportunity to help pupils learn more through utilizing a variety of resources in addition to the usual textbook and curriculum guide.

All State education agencies in the Southeast region engaged in overall planning and strategy development, closely tied in with established State priorities and goals. In Ala., all State programs are coordinated by a plan developed in cooperation with the American Management Association. Efforts were made to have all programs, including title II, be supportive of priorities such as Right to Read, drug and career education, and accreditation of elemenary schools.

The Fla. Department of Education established as a priority improved and better timed services to local education agencies. Flexible timetables, revised applications, and dissemination of information are among the title II priorities which fit in with comprehensive State planning. The complete reorganization of the State educational agency along functional lines has relocated the title II program in the Library Centers and Learning Resources Section of the Bureau of Curriculum in an effort to group like programs together.

In the formulation of the Goals of the Kentucky Department of Education, the document which outlines the comprehensive plan of the Department to meet that State's developed priorities for education for the next five years, the title II program was given equal consideration with other Federal programs. This is specifically reflected in the goal which calls for the efficient distribution of resources that support the instructional process within the State. The ESEA title II program affects all of the goals since acquisition and utilization of library materials are essential to the success of all educational efforts.

In Md., the State education agency and local educational agencies were engaged in a management study which involves an appraisal of needs and the setting of measurable goals and objectives. The critical needs given highest priority were: improvement of reading, improved knowledge of and increased acceptance of people of different ethnic or racial backgrounds, programs in early childhood education, and programs for career education. These needs will be met in some measure through application for title II funds for the purchase of a variety of materials in form, content and level for specified teachers and learners.

In Tenn., comprehensive State education agency planning included providing services to local educational agencies to assist them in the improvement of the total education program. Services included assistance in planning, evaluation, and implementation of programs designed to meet the educational needs of students. The title II program provided learning resources needed to help meet those educational needs.

From the Mid-Continent area, Idaho reported that the organizational structure of the State Department of Education is designed to facilitate planning and coordination of all programs, including ESEA title II. Within the framework of the State agency, a Coordinating Council is assigned the development of long-range plans for the agency. The Program Administrator of Federal Programs and the Deputy State Superintendent in charge of Instructional Services serve on this Council. The title II coordinator is in the Division of Instructional Services, an arrangement allowing for close cooperation and planning with subject area consultants. This set-up proved ideal in planning programs and utilizing media materials to best advantage in all the disciplines.

> No major changes have been made in the assignment of responsibilities within the title II program. The Educational Media Consultant has the primary responsibility of working with librarians and teachers on the selection and utilization of media and program development for title II. The subject area consultants advise teachers of the availability of materials through title II, and the supporting equipment available under NDEA title III, and urge them to consider all possibilities in planning a comprehensive educaional program.

In Louisiana, where comprehensive State education planning included the generation of a career development program, several components of title II management goals would seem to mesh -- "to provide a variety of instructional materials for use in instructional programs where a source of study materials is limited", and to "provide adequate instructional materials for use of children and teachers by building school library resources to the level of the Southern Association Standards".

Comprehensive planning in the states stressed efforts to improve instruction at all levels. Oklahoma and New Mexico, as did many other States, pointed out that ESEA Title II management goals help make this improvement possible. Several States were explicit in describing how ESEA Title II management goals fit into comprehensive State Agency planning. Among these was Texas, where schools apply to participate in title II, together with other State and Federal programs, through the Consolidated Application for State and Federal Assistance Form. The Consolidated Application is designed to decrease local school duplication in application and reporting procedures, and to allow the school to plan for programs in the Consolidated Application in light of the total school program rather than as isolated units. Through use of the Consolidated Application, the educational program -- the curriculum, instruction, pupil services, and all activities that support these is reexamined and replanned as necessary, to meet the changing needs of the people served. The consolidated form enables the school district not only to apply these funds to the purposes and objectives for which they are by law intended, but also to coordinate them for most effective use.

A high priority in Texas is the development of an Instructional Resource System to facilitate evaluation, selection, acquisition, and utilization of all resources available to the local campus, or when appropriate from district region or State, to collect and provide support data, and to promote staff efficiency through a professional development program. This priority is managed by the Director, Division of Instructional Resources, who has title II management responsibilities. A committee, under the Director, Division of Instructional Resources, and representatives of the various program development divisions, assumes responsibility for determining content areas in which title II funds allocated to the Regional Education Service Centers are to be expanded. Subjects are selected on the basis of needs identified by the Texas Education Agency staff and are aligned with the State's educational goals.

The Wymong State Department of Education acts as a service-oriented agency for local educational agencies. ESEA Title II in that State reported working closely with it in project planning and materials acquisition. Management goals for title II in the Upper Midwest have been developed as specific sub-goals of those developed by the State education agency.

In Mo., the goal to receive and approve special needs projects for reading improvement and developmental reading is a part of the State agency's goal to improve the reading ability of all school children through the Sequential Reading Program.

Projects in Neb. are directly related to its State educational goals, such as: (1) providing appropriate edcuational resources so that each student may develop his special intellectual and creative abilities and (2) assisting each institution to account systematically for the resources it uses and the results it achieves. The Kans. title II staff assisted the Planning, Evaluation and Research Section in planning and performing district-wide evaluation for accreditation purposes and cooperated with the Elementary and Secondary Accreditation Section in reviewing standards and in formulating alternative accreditation procedures for school media programs.

In Mich., the Department of Education developed statewide goals for the title II programs under which local districts must spell out their own objectives and plan for evaluation of projects. A statewide assessment of media center needs is planned as part of an overall education assessment in the State.

Illinois reported:

> Because title II funds were impounded for fiscal year 1973, there were implications at the State level in providing media staff and administering funds. Impounded funds were not released until January 1974, causing undue delay in distributing funds to local school districts. The result was a reduction in staffing. Because of these staff reductions, many activities within the section were limited in providing services to local school districts. Fiscal proceedings were reviewed and responsibilities for processing applications were placed in the fiscal unit of the Department of Instruction. This change gave more time for the professional staff in the media/library area to provide consultative services to local school districts. Although the agency is committed to a system of management by objectives, it is quite clear that all objectives were not met during 1974 because of the aforementioned impoundment of funds and the concomitant reduction in staffing.

There was a very decided correlation of title II management goals with Ind.'s comprehensive planning, as witnessed in their special grants allocations for implementation of priority concerns in the areas of reading and career education; and in the dissemination of educational resources through its professional library which provided materials for department personnel, which in turn provided in-service training, research and technical assistance in the selection and utilization of media. A close working relationship the title II program and Iowa's State education agency was apparent in this report:

> The State Department of Public Instruction has prepared and published a series of 3 handbooks...Plan for Progress in the Media Center. Plans are underway for another title in the series. All of the handbooks provide information and guidelines for planning school media programs. The development

> of this latest handbook is another opportunity and/or example of how State Department planning and title II come together to work for what is best for children.
>
> Three planned statewide conferences were held during fiscal year 1974. Arrangements and plans for the conferences were made by the staff in the State Department of Public Instruction in cooperation with recommendations made by the personnel in the regional media centers. One of the purposes of the conferences was to involve media personnel from all over the State in positions at all levels of education to help in the comprehensive planning of the State Department in Public Instruction for the title II program.

From the Western region, it was learned that American Samoa credited help from ESEA title II funds in providing supplementary and curriculum-related materials as a step towards a State goal of helping each child achieve his/her maximum potential as an individual. In Hawaii the Office of Instructional Services and title II administrators reported a cooperative responsibility in the listing of materials selection:

> Meetings were held with program specialists in the Office of Instructional Services to delineate types of materials to be listed by title II, and those that would be referred to specialists in various curriculum areas. It was agreed that the OIS would be responsible for listing approved materials for enrichment or extending opportunities for learning in the subject areas. During this fiscal year, a comprehensive revision of the ESEA title II materials list was accomplished. Subject headings were selected to conform with OIS curriculum guides, resulting in the increased usefulness to teachers and educators in selection of quality materials for their students.

In Nevada, planning is formulated through its management-by-objective system, a system that derives from its Ten Common Goals for Education. School library/media center programs and ESEA title II projects are unified within this system. State planning sets goals designed for implementation of school library and media centers in local school districts, including needs assessment, program planning, acquisition of materials, and monitoring and evaluation of programs.

All Federal programs administered in Oregon are required to support instruction-related priorities as set out by the State education agency. This assures that management goals for title II are an integral part of State planning.

These instruction-related priorities are in the areas of childhood and primary education, career education, culturally and economically disadvantaged -- all areas requiring the special kinds of materials that can be provided with title II funding.

In describing how management goals fitted into comprehensive State agency planning in the State of Washington, the report revealed that:

> All ESEA Title II programs and activities have been incorporated into the overall comprehensive Goals for the Common Schools, which were developed by the staff of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and adopted by the Washington State Board of Education in January 1972.
>
> Washington continued using its Consolop (consolidated application forms and uniform reporting procedures) for ESEA Title I, II, III and NDEA III, with over 25 districts in the State. A program priority survey was conducted by the Division of Curriculum and Instruction to identify areas of greatest need, Supervisors within the Division of Curriculum and Instruction work together to assist school districts improving programs that depend upon the effective use of learning mateirals. This year operating plans for the title II program were coordinated with both directors and supervisors within the State education agencies. Operating plan provided increased effectiveness in organizational budgeting and evaluation of management performances.

6. Program Goals

Program goals in the title II program relate to specific needs for instructional materials in various curriculum areas, in different formats to accomplish varied teaching and learning styles, and to meet the needs of target groups of children. Program goals are related to State needs such as those for media in early childhood education, reading, metric education, or for gifted or disadvantaged children. State goals include media for use in staff development activities for teachers, for instructional programs for children in private as well as public schools, and in such agencies as hospitals, correctional institutions, and special schools offering educational programs for children.

Several Northeastern States cited as a program goal increasing the availability of instructional media for the use of activities related to the celebration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. Bibliographies of media on this subject were prepared and disseminated to teachers, media specialists, and pupils. A number of special purpose projects to provide media for United States history courses were funded, e.g., Early New England studies for middle school pupils in Fall River, Mass.; a new interdisciplinary course in American Civilization at E.L. Vandermeulen High School, Port Jefferson, N.Y.

The resurgence of interest in traditional crafts has combined nicely with the Bicentennial theme. Schools have purchased media in this field for use in serveral curriculum areas, e.g., the arts and humanities, social studies, and English and journalism. A somewhat related topic which has been introduced into the teaching of literature, with the associated addition of media on the subject, is the folklore of American Culture.

States also report that meeting the cultural or linguistic needs of children is an important goal. Both regular and special purpose projects are funded under this objective. For example, Bristol is one of the R.I. communities with a large Portuguese population. English as a second language is offered to non-English-speaking children in the high school and Portuguese is offered as a language course. The funds from title II helped to enlarge and increase the collection of bilingual and cultural media. From the increased use of these media, local school personnel in Bristol judge that the media have had a positive effect on learners. In Brookline, Mass., a two-year elective course in Mandarin Chinese is being piloted as a language option. Title II funds are being used to acquire enrichment materials in art, music, literature and history.

A group of children who have been targeted in some States to receive special attention under title II are children living in sparsely populated areas. Vt., for example, still has 8 one-room schools where local resources are extremely limited. Title II has placed some new attractive books of high quality into the hands of children attending these schools. Maine's two regional media centers are providing a demonstration of cooperative media activities for several small schools. The center at Waterville provides weekly delivery of materials to a number of these schools, with teachers in all schools participating in the preview and selection of media. The effect of the Waterville project has been to enrich basic learning media in the schools and to provide more flexible teaching styles with the varied media formats made available.

N.J. is one of the Northeastern States giving special attention to children in various types of institutions. The 23 State institutions and agencies were organized in fiscal year 1974 into the Garden State School District. These schools, enrolling 5.245 pupils in that year, were awarded almost $9,000 in title II funds for the acquisition of books, periodicals, and other media. It should be noted that Federal expenditures for books for these schools comprised nearly 40% of the total expenditures for books and that books purchased under title II for the use of children in these institutions represent almost 15% of the total book collection. Federal expenditures for audio-visuals for these schools represent approximately 23% of the total expenditure for non-print media.

Del. has adjusted a program goal on the basis of information collected through monitoring activities. Visits to schools indicated that some schools had misinterpreted the acquisition of high-interest/low-vocabulary reading materials to mean only fiction and were missing an opportunity to purchase and encourage children to read in the content fields. Information has been disseminated to correct this interpretation and encourage the acquisition of easy-to-read media on a variety of subjects.

The acquisition of media to support metric education claimed a fair amount of attention in fiscal year 1974. Although some of the physical hands-on-items are not eligible for purchase under title II, pictures, charts, films, filmstrips, transparencies, slides and kits have been widely purchased and used. Materials are in use not only in mathematics and science classes but in language arts, social studies, industrial arts, home economics, and physical education classes.

Energy crisis teaching resources have also commanded attention in developing social studies and science projects under title II. Newspapers, magazines, and books have assisted classes to compare the sources of energies in various societies with contemporary uses. Since much of the visual material now available in schools is out-of-date and emphasizes heavy use of non-renewable sources of energy, teachers and media specialists are carefully reviewing their present collections and selecting new and more current audiovisual media as they become available.

Program goals for the States in the Southeastern region followed in general the pattern of Fla. There the primary goal was to administer the ESEA title II program in such a manner that the same library opportunities would be available to all children in public and private schools alike. In practice, this meant that schools with the greatest needs would receive the greatest share of available resources. The measure of the accomplishment of this objective is to be determined through an analysis of responses to the Fla. Statutes Accreditation Standards. Among other of its management goals, D.C. called attention to a growing trend throughout the country of calling on communities for support, thus broadening the base of cooperation. From Ga., the goals stressed the importance of materials and their acquisition:

1. To provide a variety of quality resources for the use of pupils and teachers in elementary and secondary instructional programs that will meet the individual needs of pupils
2. To make available adequate quantities of high quality school library resources relevant to the units of study in elementary and secondary school instructional programs, resources that will stimulate learning in individualized study situations as well as in group activities
3. To provide sufficient quantities of quality audiovisual and printed materials for use by children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools in support of the curriculum
4. To stimulate local school systems to replace obsolete school library resources and textbooks with up-to-date materials
5. To provide professional materials that will enable teachers to be resourceful and effective
6. To stimulate through Federal assistance an awareness at the local education agency level of a need to increase funds for instructional media
7. To provide materials that will stimulate a desire in each pupil to develop skills in reading which will enable him to read to the full limit of his ability
8. To provide materials that give each pupil an opportunity for occupational exploration that will lead to wise choice of career

In 1971, the Md. State Department of Education published Criteria for Modern School Media Programs "to provide guidelines for schools which are incorporating new educational approaches into their curriculum programs". Unified media programs are recommended for the State, the school system, and the individual building programs. Unified programs of service are provided by the State: 20 of the 24 school systems have system-level centralized integrated media services, and 97% of the individual public schools have unified programs. When, however, the individual categories of staff, services, facilities and funds are examined, no school system fully meets all requirements. The title II program, relating as it does to media services, has helped pave the way to public acceptance of the concept that students learn various ways through exposure to many kinds of resources. Programs now require and will continue to demand more accessibility to and availability of good media programs. The goal of the ESEA title II program in Md. is to provide assistance for the development of media programs which will bring the 24 educational agencies into compliance with the categories of resources and funds expended as set forth in the Criteria. Funds will be used to:

1. Provide materials so that all elementary and secondary students of the State will have media available to support their instructional and recreational needs
2. Provide title II assistance to local educational agencies with the development of system media programs
3. Assist local school personnel in the evaluation and redesigning of existing and/or new media programs
4. Provide inservice opportunities for local personnel to make more effective utilization of media resources
5. Provide statewide ethnic and cultural workshops and reading/media workshops designed to make local representatives aware of trends and development in utilization of ethnic, cultural and reading materials
6. Establish cooperative program activities which will be of mutual benefit to information seekers

Again and again, the States listed among their goals a sharing of responsibility for materials selection and use -- some through Advisory Councils and others through faculty and student recommendations. Ky.'s goal "to involve the school guidance staff in the selection of materials for their own and pupil use" was a logical step to its next two goals "to conduct needs assessment in these areas (guidance materials) and to prepare bibliographies of materials used in vocational education". Miss. had a similar goal of providing "up-to-date material on educational and occupational guidance" and also in seeking out "materials for special education programs and resources in the area of social problems, such as drug abuse and environmental/ecological education".

In the Mid-Continent region, program goals were frequently curriculum-oriented, as in Wyo. where stress was laid on materials availability for students through systematic procedures of handling and greater accessibility of materials through a centralized collection. As for special project grants, each application was required to contain documentation showing critical district need, to list several objectives relating to that need, and to indicate in-service training to facilitate better utilization of materials. The title II staff in Ark. held seven workshops for librarians/media specialists, principals and superintendents, to review priorities and clarify procedures in line with program goals. Title II projects were monitored and the title II coordinator reviewed the programs in line with title II objectives. All title II applications were carefully screened and many districts were directed to make certain changes which would result in improvement of the programs. Memoranda concerning interpretation, direction and general information on the function and progress of the programs were distributed at frequent intervals to all districts -- aid in planning and selection was given to private as well as to public schools. Staff also screened purchase orders for those schools not having librarians/media specialists.

Program goals in Colo., on the local level were set by ESEA title II advisory committees. Special goals for their demonstration centers founded with special purpose grants were:

1. To facilitate the learner's realization and attainment of a quality education
2. To provide an educationally functional school library program which will serve the personal needs, interests, abilities, and creative potential of the learner and the developmental demands of the curriculum
3. To improve existing school library media programs and serve as a model for further progress in the development of school library media centers
4. To integrate comprehensive learning resources with the teaching and learning process.

Idaho's program goals leaned heavily towards fulfilling the need for high quality/adequate quantity of library resources and instructional materials. Included was the provision of professional materials for teachers.

A need to increase non-book materials was cited in both N.M. and La., as well as the need to upgrade reference materials and supplemental reading books. La. mentioned support for special and specific education programs, i.e., reading, career education, Right-to-Read, and teacher training. Mont. listed seven program goals. Those of special significance were:

1. The State education agency will conduct on-site visitations to assist the local school district in developing and implementing a plan for the use of title II funds as well as providing assistance in the selection of materials
2. The State education agency will conduct regional workshops to encourage local education agencies to participate to maximum advantage in this program
3. The State education agency will disseminate information on a continuing basis to all eligible LEAs, describing the opportunities afforded by this program to strengthen their learning and library resources in the schools
4. To secure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds and to avoid suplication of effort, the Superintendent of Public Instruction will establish such requirements as may

> be necessary to assure the effective and efficient coordination of the ESEA title II program with any program conducted under the Library Services and Construction Act. The State educational agency and the Mont. State Library Commission will hold periodic meetings to coordinate programs at the State and local levels.

Okla. was not alone in having as a primary goal the provision of assistance in the developing and/or strengthening of library/media centers. It attempted to reach this goal by on-site visits to local educational agencies by the title II coordinator, by conducting six regional library/media workshops, and by maintaining a professional collection of materials for loan to local educational agencies.

Program goals in Tex. included program review and technical assistance activities, an effort to implement the State program of Learning Resources Centers through performance of office routines, development and dissemination of guidelines for Campus Learning Resources, program support for the Right-to-Read schools, and an emphasis on in-service education beamed towards the planning process for Campus Learning Resources Centers. Moving towards systems-oriented planning seemed implicit in Utah's resolve to have on record the data concerning current status, one-year goals and five-year media goals for every school in the State. Among other significant goals were:

1. To establish and maintain model demonstration centers in various areas of the State

2. To provide the leadership and motivation to promote the integrated media program in every school in every district in the State

As in other regions of the country, so in the Upper Midwest -- program goals varied from State to State, determined by the specific needs for instructional materials in the various subject areas, and by different formats to support a variety of teaching and learning styles. Goals set by these States fall into 2 broad categories - (1) Changes in curricula and media services and (2) Consultative assistance and in-service training. In the first category, Ill. reported a proposed revision of State standards for media services; Mo., an evaluation of all school libraries, relating its findings to inproved learning resources services, materials collections and physical facilities. N. Dak. likewise is coordinating standards for library/AV programs while Ohio is encouraging local schools to move from classroom collections to central collections, or to move from traditional libraries to integrated media centers. S. Dak. offered the assistance of its Statistics and Planning Section to local educational agencies, and Wis. continued to encourage and support the development of centralized library/media facilities in schools throughout the State. Ind. introduced materials on metric education and provided assistance to programs concerned with alternative education.

In the second category, dealing with consultative assistance and in-service training, both Mich. and N. Dak. supported workshops -- the former for volunteers, the latter for librarians and administrators. Wis., too, provided in-service support through regional, district and individual meetings and visits.

Ind. used a one-week Instructional Development Institute as a springboard to introduce functional media as support for instructional strategies, while Neb. had among its program goals the development of guidelines for establishing and operating a media program in elementary and secondary schools. Iowa worked towards providing current and innovative professional print and non-print materials for teachers and administrators through the 16 area media centers and the Cooperative Network of In-Service Resources located in the Marshalltown Center. Mich. had as a program goal the sponsorship of Freedom to Read Conferences, designed to meet the need of wise, but wide, selection of materials and to offset efforts to limit the range of materials available to students. Mich. also supported the goal of providin occupational and career information materials in-depth.

Guam listed among its program goals the preparation of basic minimal collections of library resource materials for the opening of newly constructed schools; the acquisition of materials essential for professional growth of the staff; the assistance of teachers in the selection and effective use of instructional materials and equipment; and the instruction of staff in production of instructional materials. Hawaii's goals coincided with those of so many of the States in attempts to provide greater in-service education to school librarians, teachers, administrators, and counselors and also to provide support to those curriculum areas where needs for additional resources are greatest.

In the Trust Territory, it was reported:

> Program goals are determined by the 6 districts after meeting with Selection Committees. These are more in the nature of priorities than goals. For example, a given district may set as a high priority the acquisition of films that can be used by all schools in support of one or more subject areas. Although we do not require districts to list their goals, they can be summarized in an overall statement: To obtain improved materials that will support and develop programs in science (including health), mathematics, social studies, bilingual programs and occupational education.

Wash., as did other States, stressed the goal of increasing the varieties and numbers of materials available to small school districts. Another of its program goals was to provide funding for learning resources demonstration centers throughout the State.

Because the testimony to Congress which prompted the writing and passing of title II in 1965 gave great attention to the fact that so many public schools were without school libraries, a major program goal in all States has been establishment of centralized school media centers. Information was collected in 1974 on the number of public elementary and secondary schools with libraries or media centers (Table 16). This information was available from 43 States or other areas participating in title II. Twenty-one States, American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported that all public secondary schools had libraries or media centers; six States and Guam reported having libraries or media centers in all public elementary schools.

The proportion of public elementary schools with libraries or media centers increased significantly during the fourteen year period from 1960-61 to 1974 - from 31.2 percent to almost 79 percent. This remarkable development can be attributed to the impetus of the ESEA Title II program, development of State, regional and national school media standards which included elementary schools, State and local support, and Federal support of reading improvement through such programs as NDEA Title III, ESEA Title I, and the Right to Read program.

During this same period, the proportion of secondary schools with libraries or media centers increased only slightly; however, it should be noted that the proportion of public secondary schools with libraries or media centers was already high, their provision having been encouraged for many years by secondary school accreditation procedures. The difference in provision of libraries or media centers in public elementary and secondary schools by regions of the United States is shown in Table 18. The New England region made the greatest progress in developing both elementary and secondary school libraries over the 14 year period from 1960 to 1974; however, two other regions - the Southeast and the Great Lakes regions - increased the proportion of public elementary school libraries or media centers by more than 50 percent.

The increase in public secondary schools with libraries or media centers has been very slight except in New England and the Far West regions, with four regions actually showing a small decrease in the proportion of public secondary schools with libraries or media centers.

7. How the Relative Need Formulas Reflected Program Goals

Section 117.3(b) of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the distribution of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials among eligible public and private elementary and secondary school children and teachers according to their relative need for these materials. Criteria for relative need are established by each State on the basis of a number of factors, e.g., quantity, quality, and recency of materials currently available to children and teachers, requirements of regular or special instructional programs, cultural or linguistic needs of children and teachers, degree of economic need, and degree of past and present financial efforts to provide materials in relation to financial ability.

In Del., results of the State testing program showed a high correlation between financial status of families and reading achievement of children. The title II relative need formula has therefore directed a significant amount of funds to school districts enrolling children from families of low income. The greatest financial support for media goes to school districts that are economically disadvantaged, those that have the poorest or most inappropriate collections of media, and those with the largest number of children. Over $160,000 was spent in fiscal year 1974 on Del. title II projects related to reading.

Concern for minority groups was expressed in one of Mich.'s program goals:

> To support the goal of providing materials at all levels and in all formats for Spanish-speaking and American Indian students, the title II office, aided by a committee, will distribute to every school building a bibliography of such materials to aid schools in their selection,

and from Minn.:

> Funds were spent to expand an outstanding depository of Indian and Mexican-American media materials at Brainerd. Materials housed in this cultural center may be used by all schools in the State.

Minn. also numbered among its goals the establishment of a model Right-to-Read program and assistance to a program for the gifted child by providing materials.

In the Western region, Alaska reported that for a variety of reasons, in-service programs for title II were limited. However, technical assistance was provided by the Federal Programs staff in helping local educational agencies with their proposals for special purpose grants. American Samoa, whose school library program was a late starter (in 1970) continues to work on building its basic collections and reaching a standard of ten books per student.

Among Ariz.'s program goals were:

1. Special purpose grants will be available to new schools opening libraries to assist them in establishing basic collections of materials and to schools establishing libraries for the first time
2. Professional materials for use by library media personnel throughout the State will be available for loan from the Department of Education
3. State Agency will assist private schools as much as possible
4. Minimum basic grants of $475 will be established for schools with at least 50 students but no central collection of materials
5. Maximum grants of $3,575 will be established for schools, regardless of the size of enrollment.

From the Bureau of Indian Affairs, program goals were basic: to increase services to the smaller isolated schools where no library and media activities are available other than through their own resources. Emphasis was also placed on working with other titles-funded projects to increase materials on career choices.

The Mass. relative need formula, revised in fiscal year 1973 began to make its impact felt in fiscal year 1974. The former simple count of library items per pupil as an index of need was replaced by a compilation of local expenditures per pupil for media. An incentive category measuring local effort against national media standards was introduced. School districts welcomed the revised formula grant program in that it linked print and nonprint programs separated by the State budget code, allowing combinations of budget in some districts and more coordinated planning in others.

The N.J. relative need formula was developed to assure that children and teachers in elementary schools and children and teachers in urban schools receive the largest share of title II benefits. Essex County, for example, which contains Newark, N.J.'s largest city, received nearly 11% of the State's title II program funds. The basic grant formula in Maine results in 42% of the schools receiving very small allocations. State title II staff and the State Advisory Council question seriously the impact of these small amounts of funds spread so widely; however, concentrating funds appears inadvisable because of the universal need for media in nearly all of Maine's schools. The incentive grants awarded to those Maine elementary schools that make a local commitment for media staff and facilities, does concentrate larger amounts of title II funds in a few schools for greater effectiveness.

Conn.'s relative need formula takes into account two factors, (1) the number of disadvantaged children in a school system and (2) the local educational agency's financial ability to support education. By applying these relative need factors in determining allocations for public and private schools and through special projects, the funds made available support program goals designed to encourage discrimination in selection of media, professional involvment, and long range planning. Pa. reported the need to restudy its relative need formula to determine its effectiveness. After nine years, it was felt that Pa. schools should have sufficient State and local support to minimize continued Federal support. Concentration of funds in fewer schools was recommended for consideration in future planning.

Schools in the Southeastern region likewise followed a pattern of economic factors, availbility of materials (or lack thereof) and achievement of basic skills in determining their relative need formulas. Tenn. provided a direct insight into the relationship between a relative need formula and program goals:

> The relative need formula is based on economic factors which determine the ability of a local education agency to support its educational program. The ESEA title II goal of providing financial assistance for acquiring learning resource materials uses the relative need formula in determining the proportionate amount of financial assistance to be provided each LEA for this specific purpose.

In its Educational Policy for the State of Florida, the first and most important goal listed is competency in basic skills. Because of the relationship between economic deprivation and lack of achievement, 75% of its funds are distributed on this basis. Through a comprehensive assessment of collections of school library resources and instructional materials supportive of the curriculum, Ky. was able to arrive at its relative need formula. The assessment covered all local educational agencies and private schools. In establishing need, these various factors were considered: quantity, quality, appropriateness and accessibility of resources, the nature of the instructional program, and the adequacy of facilities and personnel.

The N.C. title II State Plan provides that local education agencies can use program funds to purchase materials related to educational priorities. State priorities included career education, reading, early childhood education, improved opportunities for the disadvantaged, and programs for the handicapped. Local educational agencies selected those priorities which reflected the needs of students and included history of African, Eastern and Western cultures, drug awareness, ecology, and N.C. history. The relative need formula is designed to be applied to the individual school based on instructional program and priorities, and the amounts of instructional materials available to support these programs and priorities. While the need for library resources and other printed and published instructional materials continues to exist in all school districts in S.C., the need is more critical in school districts having high concentrations of children from low-income families. The relative formula reflects this need in that 50% of the funds are directed to those districts enrolling large numbers of low-income children.

States of the Mid-Continent region were unanimous in declaring that the relative need factor strongly influenced program goals, although some States were more specific than others in documenting their cases. Okla., conceding that the title II program is not reflected directly in fiscal year 1974 program goals went on to conclude that the "relative need formula is fundamental to the program". Ark., using the standard of 20 books per student, continued to use quantity as a factor in its formula and required each district to determine its deficiencies, and allocated funds on the basis of the verified deficiencies.

Wyo. felt that its relative need formula needed some kind of revision, largely because it is outdated (formulated in 1965). Its two parts are based on (1) numbers of library books in a given LEA and (2) school population. Unhappy as this State is with its formula, it has some merit in that the report concluded that "the greater number of books per student in a district, the less money is allocated per pupil enrollment. This tends to place title II funds in the areas of greatest need".

Program goals in Idaho still remain just that. Emphasizing that its schools do not meet national media standards and that only a minimum number of elementary schools meet State guidelines, the title II report stated that no changes were made in its relative need formula for fiscal year 1974.

Mont., in contrast, seemed relatively pleased with its relative need formula and its effect on program goals, stating that it "provided allocations for disadvantaged children, and proved effective in providing equitable funding for all those schools that applied". Relative need in Colo. is measured through the relationship of a given school district's assessed valuation and its resources holdings. Entitlements are then based 90% on economic need and 10% on current resources need. This formula provides that "the greatest amount of money goes to those districts least able to provide school library resources and instructional materials to students and teachers".

The majority of State plans for States in the Upper Midwest used factors such as economic need, quality and quantity of materials currently available, degree of local financial effort in relation to a district's financial ability, and establishment of centralized building media services, in promulgating their relative need formulas. An example of direct relationship between program goal and relative need formula is provided by Mich. A program goal to provide a wide variety of materials for student and teacher use in areas of high concentration of deprivation fitted in well with a factor in its relative need formula, which provides that 35% of title II funds go to districts where 20% of the enrolled students come from homes where parents made less than $2,000 per year, or whose mothers receive Aid to Dependent Children, or who live in foster homes. Sharing in extra benefits provided by this factor were 232,814 students in 89 districts in fiscal year 1974.

A number of program goals set by States were indirectly related to relative need, of which Mo. provided an example. The relative need formula by which district allocations are calculated included these factors: number of pupils and teachers, degree of economic need, previous financial effort, and quantity and quality of library resources currently available. The use of this formula provides per pupil amounts varying from district to district in support of acquisitions for the improvement of library collections. The use of this formula proved of help in the achievement of Mo.'s first program goal: "Conduct an evaluation of all school libraries to assist...in planning improved library programs".

Proof that the relative need formula is no static thing, but can evolve to serve as an effective instrument in the achieving of new program goals was illustrated by Neb.:

> The relative need formula was designed originally to consider economic need, local effort, the collection in its relation to State approval and accreditation standards, the utilization as reflected through staff, facility, and the organization for services. Over the years, since its inception in 1968, these factors have been amended so as to consider changes prompted through the application of the relative need formula.
>
> For example, as the valuation per resident pupil increased each year, the weighted point value designated for economic need was extended to encompass a broader range of dollar values in an effort to lend greater assistance to areas of minimal value. Similarly, as collections reached maximum point value in relation to accreditation standards, changes were effected in the weighted point value so as to adjust for such improvement. Such deverse factors as central processing and participation through a regional media center were worked into the formula to reflect increased local effort.
>
> All program goals were drawn to promote improved media programs. All aspects of improved media programs were touched by the original relative need formula, and in turn changes were made necessary to reflect growth. To separate relative need formula and its application from the program goals of title II would be difficult indeed.

States in the West reported a variety of relative need/program goals correlation from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands where it seemed to be arrived at on a subjective basis, to Hawaii, which reported revising the formula so as to emphasize aspects of its State's program needs. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands reported:

> Selection committees and headquarters personnel continue to determine relative need primarily on the basis of their on-the-scene professional judgment as to the quality and quantity of materials available at the time selections are made, as compared to the need for additional material necessitated by increased enrollments and the ability of teachers and students to utilize increasingly sophisticated reading and instructional materials.

Nev. interpreted its overall program goal of assisting local educational agencies in implementing title II projects, as a tie-in with its relative need formula, components of which are:

1. The quantity and quality of resources, books, and materials already available for use of children and teachers
2. The degree of economic need in the district
3. The degree of previous and current financial efforts for providing such materials in relation to financial ability
4. The value judgment of professionally qualified school library supervisory personnel who are familiar with the needs of children and teachers in relation to resources, books and materials
5. Critical educational needs established by a systematic assessment.

Many States have problems compounded, with many schools located in isolated areas and having small enrollments. Ariz. attempts to alleviate the situation by granting such schools a basic $475. As for its relative need formula, it is a composite of several things:

> ...the quantity of school library resources, the trained personnel to promote the use of materials and to insure the acquisition of quality materials, pupil enrollment, and the maintenance of effort expenditures for library resources at the school district level.

8. Achievement of Program Goals

State departments of education reported some success in attaining the program goals developed for the title II program in fiscal year 1974. The degree of success attained was based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

Nearly every Northeastern State reported a reasonable level of achievement in the objective of providing a variety of materials in form, content and level of difficulty of media for use of children and teachers in schools where formerly a single textbook was the chief source of study. Conn., for example, mentioned a school where, with the exception of textbooks there were only two dozen books in one kindergarten class to keep the children's interest for the entire year. Only a few children were reported to use them. After a grant from title II of $1,500 for new books for 54 children, an average of 20 children in each of the two daily sessions used the books.

Another objective -- to provide audiovisual media for schools where libraries are in a transitional stage of development from a collection consisting largely of printed materials into a broadly based media program -- has been essentially achieved in some schools; however, needs for up-to-date materials in all forms and on all subjects continue to be noted.

Several Northeastern States commented on the impetus that title II has continued to give to the employment of media personnel to organize materials and assist with their use. The following comments from the N.J. and Pa. reports are illustrative of this point:

> N.J.:
>
> The relative need formula has increased the number of libraries and librarians in elementary schools. Districts are willing to employ staff when materials and collections are built up. In September, 1974, there were 1,074 elementary school librarians, an increase from 930 in 1971.
>
> Pa.:
>
> ESEA title II is specifically responsible for the increase of the materials available in the public and private schools of the Commonwealth. This year, every public school building in Philadelphia is served by an aide or a professional because a real library exists. This is a major step forward.

A Conn. program goal -- to improve the selection of media -- was assisted by the release in 1974 of a small share of funds allotted for 1973. Schools were encouraged to use these funds to obtain appropriate selection guides. Most did so and a definite improvement in the quality of media selected for purchase is noticeable.

In Del., where local school districts chose their own program goals for title II, the majority opted for a strengthened reading program, with career education next in line. As for attainment of providing career resources materials, success has been limited, "because the career education program in many schools is still in the development stages and the purchase and utilization of resources is still slow". Conclusions for an improved rate of success -- "There must be a well-developed instructional program for ESEA title II goals to be effective in terms of improvement of learning".

Serious consideration is being given in Maine to changing its policy whereby regular grants are distributed to 99% of its public schools and to 65% of its private schools. The effect of small amounts of money so thinly spread left little impact on the program or its goals. However, an upbeat note was sounded in the report of the establishment of two regional media center projects, one at Waterville and one at Farmington.

Mass. reported a continuing degree of success with program goals of upgrading curricula through use of title II monies. Minigrants were awarded to provide materials in the fields of special education, occupational and career education, and in the newer areas of women's studies, consumerism, sex education and metrication. By working with staff at local levels to improve curricula, provide materials and integrate services, N.H. achieved several of its program goals.

Cooperation with subject matter specialists resulted in publication of curriculum materials relating to veneral disease, reading, and environmental education. Title II funds were then made available for the purchase of these curriculum materials. One of N.H.'s goals, "To develop an effective program of dissemination of model educational projects relating to all State and Federal programs operating within the Division", resulted in a special purpose grant to Hampton (Supervisory Union #21):

> ...to break out of the traditional library format of a collection of strictly print materials. The value of motion to elementary school children is evident and the Marston Elementary School in Hampton would capitalize on available alternatives which can successfully compete with commerical television.

Marston Elementary School then proceeded to establish an exemplary multi-media library which offered modern materials via films and tapes to move students beyond study with the print collection to become more visually literate. Among the many States reporting the goal of providing materials of high quality was Vermont. It reported attaining success through its book-selection workshops, four in number, with five sessions in each conducted throughout the school year.

Reports of achievement of program goals were very positive throughout the Southeastern States. All States reported the continued acquisition of numbers of books that would enable individual schools to meet standard numbers of books per child as set by State, regional, and national professional associations and accrediting boards. Specifically, Alabama provided leadership in the use of selection aids and reviewing media, in the assessment of local needs, in conducting in-service training, and in making a variety of media available for "hands on" examination. Results of these efforts were reflected in the projects which showed that materials such as art prints, paperback books, slides, transparencies, cassette tapes and multi-media kits are being widely purchased in large quantities. Georgia, in assessing achievement of program goals, made the following statement:

"It is difficult to assess separately the attainment of each program goal, since each is an essential element in providing high quality resources to meet the unique needs of individual students who are the consumers in the instructional program. The project applications reflect a greater variety of media resources and an improved quality of projects from year to year. In many schools the media specialist is an active participant in the instructional team, assisting teachers in the selection, preparation and utilization of instructional materials. Selections are made that support research type teaching at varied interest and reading ability levels."

Both Georgia and South Carolina were among the many States reporting an increase in library holdings. In South Carolina, only six secondary schools reported collections having fewer books per child than the requirement set forth in State standards; four of these were new schools with new media centers. The average number of books per student in secondary media centers was 10.2. Once school districts achieved South Carolina's State standard in holdings, they were encouraged to use title II funds to implement instructional activities designed to meet critical needs. In fiscal year 1974, $368,171 was expanded towards this effort. Georgia also used title II funds to effect changes in the instructional program, designed to provide learning experience for each individual student. These changes included implementation of the quarter system, flexible scheduling and open classrooms, which in turn have created a demand for more media.

In an effort to measure the degree of achievement of its program goals, Mississippi submitted a questionnaire to local education agencies. The results indicated 98% of the local educational agencies felt that they would not be able to maintain materials in library/media centers at desired levels without the help of ESEA Title II; 83% reported that individualized instruction had been implemented because of increased amounts of instructional materials provided by the program.

Virginia reported that its goal for quality selection of materials has met with a fair degree of success. State media personnel took advantage of every opportunity to focus on this need. Schools were encouraged to develop local selection policies, and local visitations were made to talk with media specialists and other school personnel. Workshops were conducted and displays provided for various groups, including State agency sponsored subject area conferences and principals' conferences. The conference space available at the Media Examination Center. School Libraries and Textbook office proved to be a drawing card for small groups wishing to examine the many examples of newer media. Virginia also reported success with expanding collections -- by June 1974, only three divisions had fewer than ten books per child, and fewer than 10 elementary schools were without centralized media services. Reports also indicated growing collections of audiovisuals, with many of the Special Project applications designed for emphasis of nonbook materials.

Reports from the Mid-Continent were also generally sanguine about achievement of program goals. Idaho reported its goals as "partially achieved", stating what in essence was said in varying manner by other States:

> There is a constant feedback from the educational community that title II has been one of the best programs for providing tangible assistance for students and teachers. Their comments are not based on evaluative data, but on their experiences with students and teachers in the classrooms since more library and other instructional materials have become available for use.

Not surprisingly, many States continued to have goals relating to "Right to Read" or reading improving through provision of media. Louisiana provided funding for 18 parishes to establish model libraries in "newly-created Right to Read Parishes". (These were in addition to 18 perviously funded).

Oklahoma's umbrella program goal: "To provide assistance in developing and strengthening library/media centers", was achieved through (1) visits to local education agencies by a new title II coordinator, (2) regional workshops involving teacher-librarians, librarian/media specialists, supervisory media personnel, and school administrators, (3) professional collections of materials for loan to local education agencies and (4) tightening--up of standards for quality materials purchased with title II funds.

Utah was one of many States reporting the establishment of model media centers -- the four in elementary schools, one in junior high, four in high schools and one in a combined junior-senior high represented a goal achievement that provides facilities for observation of outstanding media programs. From Wyoming it was noted that local budgets in 90% of its schools have maintained or increased their level of spending over the past ten years. The report went on to state , "A large portion of the credit can be directed to the incentive of title II. The real incentive for local education budgets came from attention provided by required planning, implementing and evaluation of ESEA Title II projects."

Achievement of program goals in the Upper Midwest was mixed, with some States reporting a degree of achievement in the area of supporting changes in curricula and media services, and others claiming success in providing consultative assistance and in-service training. From Mich. came reports of several workshops:

> Three Freedom to Read workshops were held during fiscal year 1974. All were oversubcribed and enthusiasm was high. Title II, ESEA shared the costs with LSCA...These workshops alerted people to the problems [of censorship], often made them tighten their selection procedures, and prompted many media people and their school boards to adopt written selection policies or to evaluate those already in existence.
>
> Another workshop which benefited school and public librarians (again with funds from LSCA and ESEA title II) was "The Library's Role In American Indian Education"...It could not reach everyone who should have benefited, but it made an impact and is part of a total continuing effort.

Iowa established a Cooperative Network of In-Service Resources (CNIR), whose stated purpose is to help teachers discover new ideas about education, and another organization, Iowa Network for Obtaining Resource Materials for Schools (INFORMS), with the aid of increasing the educators' level of knowledge regarding curriculum and instructional methods, educational innovation and current educational research. CNIR reached 310 (69%) of Iowa's 451 local school districts in fiscal year 1974 by providing materials at least once.

One of the major benefits deriving from the title II program has been a trend towards the centralized collection. Ohio and Wis. were representative in citing progress in this direction. From Ohio came this comment:

> Thirty-five school districts moved from or are starting to move from elementary school classroom collections to central library facilities. Since this is a long term project, no attempt has been made to tabulate the number of buildings involved...however, consultants estimate that approximately 46% of schools visited have moved or are moving to the integrated media center concept, which necessitates the remodeling of facilities.

and from Wis.:

> Attainment of this goal [centralized libraries] is measureable through a statistical study, showing that at the elementary level such facilities increased for approximately 50% to near 70%. Secondary level centers have remained constant near the 95% level.

Publications have frequently proved a useful tool in upgrading school library standards. In Neb. it was reported that combined efforts of the title II staff and the Neb. Educational Media Association, with help from the State Department of Education, produced a published guide originally aimed at evaluating existing media programs. Their Guide for Evaluating, Developing and Establishing School Media Programs eventually evolved into an instrument capable of lending direct assistance as well as to the establishment and development of new school media programs. At the time this report was made, a new edition of the Guide was in the process of being printed. "Copies of the updated version are to be sent to State departments of education, universities and colleges, and public and private schools. This achievement, prompted by the title II administration, must be viewed as the outstanding accomplishment of Neb.'s title II efforts".

States in the West, as in other areas, achieved varying degrees of success in meeting their program goals. Alaska reported that some district had strengthened their mathematics, reading, and social studies programs by coordinating title II with other Federal funding. Another State, Wash., also credited successful integration of its Federal funding resources with the attainment of program goals. Unfortunately, its goal to increase numbers and varieties of materials available to small school districts through increased participation of such districts in the title II program could not be fulfilled:

> Loss of levies in a high percentage of school districts in fiscal year 1973 resulted in the inability of many small districts to maintain local effort. As a result, there was no increase in the number of participating small schools. (Approximately 80% of the school districts participated in the fiscal year 1974 program as compared to 86% in fiscal year 1973).

The Bureau of Indian Affairs was also concerned with its small (and also isolated) schools, concentrating efforts on grades K-3 where no libraries were available, or existed only on a minimal level. It reported that it had satisfactorily reached 43 our of 110 schools, affecting 6,586 out of 12,123 children enrolled. These small schools range in size from 11 pupils at the Enemy Swain School on the Sisseton Reservation in South Dakota to 735 at Barrow Alaska.

Among Calif.'s program goals attained was one "to develop, install and operate ideological and/or technological liaison between educational agencies and related groups". To meet this goal, the ESEA title II staff initiated 37 new and examplary multimedia centers in school systems located in various regions of the State.

Guam's problems were unique, frequently compounded by the geography of long distance:

> Most proposals accepted emphasized the need for high interest, low vocabularly books, vocational/occupational/career materials and non-print materials.

> Still, the great gaps in instructional materials in all subject areas and at all levels attempting to reach predetermined standards are still there. The increased number of K-12 students is causing difficulty in providing adequate book collections. Guam experienced definite cutbacks in the total number of books and media materials due to increased shipping and freight costs.

American Samoa likewise had its own brand of problems, and in describing them, revealed some sociology:

> Attaining ten books per student is proving difficult. Currently we average 5.1 in the elementary schools, and 7.1 in secondary. Several thousand years of communal living make it difficult to instill concepts of personal ownership and responsiblity so our inventory losses often equal purchases. The fact that library books are often found in villages, tattered and worn from use keeps us hopeful since it indicates that most books lost for our inventory purposes are in fact being well used.
>
> All seven high schools have well-trained Samoan library managers, four public elementary schools have library clerks and card catalogs. Five private elementary schools and 15 public schools now have a responsible person in charge of book collections.
>
> About half our basic collection list is now in schools. This varies greatly from most mainland standards due to cultural differences and also to the fact that 90% of our students use English as a second language.

To meets its goal of support of those special curriculum areas where needs exist, Hawaii's title II program supplied funds for, among others, projects in individualized instruction, in reading, in Hawaiian and other ethnic studies related to Island cultures, and in guidance programs. It should also be noted that the private schools in Hawaii especially commended the fairness with which the ESEA title II program was administered.

The goal of providing media that met criteria of discriminating judgment was a primary one evidenced in many of the reports. Ariz.'s ten goals weighed heavily in this particular area. Schools participating in the title II program there were asked to file materials selection policy with the Board of Education (100% results not yet achieved, but coming close). Professional collections enjoyed wide distribution, seven new schools were awarded special purpose grants, and lists on diverse subjects -- sources of materials related to the Spanish-American, bilingual editions, Ariz. non-print materials, award winning books, books with Ariz. settings, books for kindergarten -- were prepared and distributed. Aware of the acute shortage of personnel and professional staffing in the private schools, Ariz.'s title II office processed materials on loan to that sector.

9. Implementation of Goals in Title II Projects

Perhaps the most interesting section of the narrative reports furnished by the States was that of "Implementation of Goals", where the title II program was described in human terms. Each participating State was asked in its fiscal year 1974 report to detail a number of projects illustrative of the effects of the implementation of program and management goals and the State plan. These projects are excellent examples of State and local efforts to provide sufficient quantities of high quality media, introduce newer types of media, and utilize those media in innovative instructional programs and curricula.

Several projects in the Northeastern States were representative of those furnishing media support to the curriculum, as in the Ralph Bunche School in N.Y. City. Specially prepared bibliographies were integrated with the curriculum through explicit references to curriculum guides. Distribution of media to classrooms is a daily feature of the program, as is flexible media center scheduling to promote opportunity for class work, small groups, and independent study. A project serving elementary school pupils in schools of the Merrimack Valley School District of N.H. was set up to support career education. Books, filmstrips, pamphlets were furnished to broaden perceptions of children whose personal observations in the career field tend to be limited. For the past several years, studies in ecology have become very popular. To answer that need Dryden Elementary School, Dryden, N.Y., used title II funds to support practical projects in the field of environmental abuse. Media are used to assist in testing hypotheses on ecology-related problems of recycling, on prevention of stream and soil erosion, and on animal feeding stations. Some projects were initiated with the special needs of children in mind, or the needs of special groups, or the opportunities and demands of independent study.

At Holy Trinity School, Wallington, Conn., children have been helped to develop new interests in curricular and recreational activities through the addition of easy-to-read books on contemporary topics. Rancocas Valley Regional High School in N.J. used title II funding to increase holdings in minority group media, women's studies, microfilm holdings of periodicals for research purposes, the American Indian, and New Jerseyana. The excellent collections in these fields offer pupils rich opportunities for independent study in languages, literature, and social studies.

An example of a school serving needs of special pupils is St. Mark's High School, Wilmington, Del. Although the school had an adequate media collection, it was used primarily by students of average ability. With title II funds, newer media were selected to provide for both gifted and talented pupils in advance courses and for those children whose working level was considered below average.

A story of gains in test scores comes from Stony Lane School, North Kingston, N.H., where students had been identified through a State testing program as having lower test scores than those in other schools of the district. Title II funds were expended for materials in the areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary development, and improvement of self-concept. Teachers, pupils and media staff indicated that these media played a major role in improving test scores over the period of a year.

The funding of a three-year project through an incentive grant resulted in the installation of a new elementary school library/media center at Sherwood Heights School, Auburn, Maine. Local funds provided both the facility and staff, which includes a full-time media specialist.

To answer the need for prior examination, or a "hands on" approach to materials selection, some States have used title II funds to develop examination centers. One such is the recently opened Kingston Center in northeastern Pa., which offers educators the opportunity to review and evaluate media prior to selection. Intermediate unit funds provided staff and facilities; title II, the media. A special collection of materials on career education is being developed.

Projects described by the States comprising the Southeastern region as exemplary and illustrative of the effects of the implementation of the ESEA title II program included all areas of the curriculum -- basic and special -- and ranged from kindergarten through grade 12. They were universally supportive of the unified media concept, and were illustrative of the fact that school administrators are convinced of the importance of a successful instructional program of a substantial collection of school library resources.

Since 1966, Ala. has consistently emphasized the strong influence that title II was exerting on the beginning and development of a statewide elementary school media program. Typical of the progress made is the program as described by the Main Avenue Elementary School in Sylacauga (grades 1-5) where 472 students are enrolled. Book circulation where averages 200 per day, in addition to which teachers check out room collections and books for unit study. Independent study time is provided each day for students, and a 30-minute planned library period is scheduled weekly for each of the 20 classes, at which time the library/media specialist works with children and teachers. To keep teachers informed of the library program and its offerings, an inservice workshop is conducted to discuss media center policies and services, and to acquaint them with the operation and use of new equipment and materials. Sylacauga is proud of its collection of books (averaging 12 per child), multimedia kits, study prints, filmstrips, globes, recordings, tapes and transparencies, much of which was made available by title II.

Inner city schools have problems uniquely their own. When they succeed in coping with some of these difficulties, it is especially gratifying to learn how they did it. One such is the Most Pure Heart of Mary School, Mobile, Ala. Many of their children come from homes that have no books, and where reading is not an activity to be enjoyed or shared. Beginning in the early grades, students are taught to read independently, and to check out books for use at home. The title II staff and teachers attribute early success in independent reading to an increased achievement in other areas of the curriculum. Langley Junior High in D.C. has also concentrated on an independent reading program. Since 1972, ESEA title II money has been used to saturate the school with both paperback and hard cover books, and with films and filmstrips taken from books. The program emphasizes silent reading, and is based on the rationale that when students are allowed to choose their own subjects and titles, and are able to read in a pleasant atmosphere conducive to learning, they develop an appreciation for reading and a curiosity to read in ever-widening areas of interest.

An individualized reading program has also been developed in Hampshire County, W. Va., for which title II funds were allotted. Three high schools and four elementary schools which had the "neediest scores" received instructional materials according to their special areas of need as indicated by the survey. Both print and nonprint resources were purchased, with the science and social studies areas of the curriculum benefitted most. With additional appropriate study skill kits and high interest/low ability materials the instructional personnel were able to effectively integrate the reading effort into the total curriculum.

In the Midcontinent, States described a variety of projects, ranging from bilingual and bicultural to the open concept school. In between were programs to enliven industrial arts, to introduce the metric system, and to provide demonstration media centers. From Cheltenham Elementary School, Denver, Colo., came the report of a program described as, "Two cultures, two languages, one people". Of the students enrolled here, 65% are Spanish surnamed which necessitates a strong bilingual and bicultural emphasis. Title II funds have made possible the purchase of books, tapes, filmstrips, transparencies, maps, charts globes, and other resources that reflect this emphasis.

A project embracing its industrial arts curriculum was described by Littleton High School, Arapahoe County, Colo.:

> Residents of our area are highly mobile and the median family income is above the State average. Since 53% of the school's 1974 graduates did not enter a 4-year college, the need to place greater emphasis on the industrial arts curriculum became apparent. Our project attempted to provide library experiences for students who were not majoring in academic subjects, and to provide them opportunities for independent study in such courses as electronics, wood shop, metals, auto mechanics, driver education, mechanical drawing, welding, and foundry. Materials purchased with title II funds leaned heavily towards the audiovisual format to provide appeal to students who were not book-oriented.

Missoula, Mont. embarked on a project to build quality collections of multi-media materials designed to individualize instruction and improve teaching methods, while Fergus High School at Lewistown, described itself as "an example of a rural county high school that has used title II funds for updating and enriching an otherwise mediocre collection. The areas that the school concentrated on this year were creative writing and world history".

From Okla. came an example of a creative media program which aids and abets the open concept school in which it is housed, and the description of a project funded by title II which resulted in full-scale cooperation of the local administration:

> Eisenhower Elementary School in Norman has a creative media program that is very much a part of the total instructional program of the school. Since this is an open concept school it is difficult to determine where the Media Center begins and ends -- which is excellent! Students may be seen in the "Numbers Nook", "Communication Center", "Answer Avenue", "People Place", or "Curiosity Corner", reading or listening to a record or tape, viewing a filmstrip, or perhaps researching in reference books. All of these resources were made available by title II and receive extensive use by teachers and students.

and

> Skyline Elementary School in Stillwater was a recipient of one of the Special Projects Grants to serve as a demonstration media center for two years. Thanks to the grant, the basic book collection was strengthened, but primarily the money was used to develop the software collection. Perhaps most important of all, the local administration exhibited its support for the media program by remodeling, building shelves, painting, and expanding the facility to three times its original size. Students and teachers are served by a full-time certified library/media specialist and a full-time aide. This is now one of the more successful media programs in the State.

Many of the States used this part of their report to provide a summary regarding their projects. Utah, after describing its model media projects located in 11 schools throughout the State as centers of examplary resource programs, had this to say about their value, "More important than the mere acquisition of equipment and materials has been the change in attitude and practice on the part of faculty and students. The media center has become the hub of activity and a true center of learning. Support from the district administration and from the public has been extremely strong. In some centers this has resulted in construction of new large facilities to accommodate the program. In others there has been extensive remodeling and enlargement. These have become truly model centers and provide show places where educators and the public can see excellent instructional programs in action".

Notice has been made elsewhere in this report that as the nation moves to adopt the metric system of measurement, schools are already preparing the coming generation to accept and understand it. One such school is the Dean Morgan Junior High School, Caspar, Wyo., where the media specialist and two 8th grade science teachers, with the help of an ESEA title II grant, built up an examplary collection on the metric system. This collection, through interlibrary loans, is made available to other school media centers in the district, until such time as their own collections become adequate.

State education agencies in the Upper Midwest cited a variety of projects that provide indications of success in accomplishing goals, both program and management, set for title II during fiscal year 1974. From Joliet Elementary School District, Will County, Ill., came word of a project built around the needs of special groups -- in this case, the deaf and the bilingual:

> Pershing School has developed both a library and a learning resources center with the use of title II and local funds. This center serves 300 students, K-8, but its uniqueness centers around both the bilingual population and deaf and hard of hearing students it serves. As well as meeting the needs of typical students, a variety of materials have been purchased to implement programs initiated by teachers to meet the varied educational needs of the deaf and hard of hearing, and the bilingual student.

Another school with another kind of specialized collection, developed with title II funds, is Lawrence Central Junior High in Kans. It has continued to build a fine ethnic section, with cooperation from Kans. State College staff in Emporia. This project is now in the final stages of evaluation.

Also in Kans., El Dorado has had for many years viable library programs on the senior and junior high school levels. However, "because elementary school library media centers had not been developed, title II funds were withheld from these. With the assistance of the title II coordinator, parent pressure, and the School Library Media Directors Association, administrators were persuaded to hire an elementary school librarian. Each of the five elementary schools now has its organized library/media center".

A project in Indiana - "Books for Boys" designed to assist in alternate approaches:

> Ordinarily a media specialist would be aghast at finding writing in the inside cover of a book which was the property of the library, but when our circulation clerk pointed out the graffiti in "The True Book of Dogs", we were delighted. A line circled the school stamp and the words written in underneath, "IS THE BEST SCHOOL IN THE WORLD". The book in which this graffiti appeared was one of those purchased with funds provided by a special grant from title II. Our program was titled "Books for Boys" and its thesis was that some boys do not succeed at reading because leisure reading materials provided are not sufficient in quantity nor of interest to them. It was our hope that if we provided the right kinds of materials at the reading level of our students, we could help them develop a positive attitude towards reading.
>
> Another facet of our program was to provide books on records or tapes for students who were frustrated by having no materials which they could read at their interest level. ...

> Materials purchased through this program have enjoyed a high rate of circulation, but even more important, we believe that the informal, spontaneous inscription in this book about dogs was an indication of the relationship between interest in a book and a good feeling about the school.

Kirksville, Missouri reported implementation of the goal, "To assist local education agencies in strengthening their nonprint holdings". Out of the total allocation of $3,770, this district chose to spend 82% ($3,007) for audiovisuals, thus reflecting administration desires to provide students and teachers with a wide variety of learning resources for improved instruction and learning opportunities.

Scattered throughout this report have been instances of title II funds granted for special projects in ethnic studies. In South Dakota, where there was a dearth of materials dealing with the culutral background of American Indian, title II funds help to alleviate this shortage. To this end, a project handling demonstration material was designed and eventually awarded to Rapid City for housing and care. This unit does not provide for use outside the center, but is always available for review by any school in the State for possible acquisition.

Two other projects reported from South Dakota, designed to serve reservation children in public schools, should be noted. One at McLaughlin, provides a sharing on Indian cultural materials. Both of these facilities provide service to all children and teachers of the area. At McLaughlin reference and reading materials about the American Indian includes legends, biographies, prose and poetry, art, music, history, food, clothing and shelter, customs and traditions. Formats include books, periodicals, records, filmstrips, cassettes, pictures. A quote from the librarian and classroom teachers assures one that, "The materials ordered have been a tremendous addition to our school, providing experiences that cannot help but enrich our program".

And from McIntosh comes testimony that, "Elementary teachers have used the materials throughout the entire teaching program. Because we now have so great a variety of materials, books, filmstrips, transparencies, pictures, slides and replicas, teachers are able to use the material throughout the year as it relates to the various subjects in hand.

A recurring theme of need for materials on careers, a burgeoning field in all schools and at all levels of instruction, has been a thread running through reports from all areas of the nation. From Wisconsin comes description of a successful project in career education:

> A small school district in out-state Wisconsin (3600 student K-12) initiated a special project to focus on career education materials. The program's intent is to help each and every student to obtain an hold a meaningful job. To accomplish this end, all teachers in the school system have been involved in the selection of materials contributing to this positive career education program. The title II office, through its

> consultants, has been in touch with the project, funded at $14,400, with a planned evaluation slated for completion in 1975-76. The entire project is in compliance with a State goal for career education, and a title II goal to "provide each child an opportunity of access to adequate collections of instructional materials.

States in the Western region realized program and management goals through a variety of projects, stressing curriculum-building materials, innovative approaches to learning, specialized collections and in-service training. In American Samoa, a reading center using village school facilities and library materials, is open two nights a week, providing a quiet, well-lighted place for study. Teachers or principals who staff it are paid from LSCA funds, while books and materials are provided by ESEA title II.

The Ariz. Children's Home in Tucson is a private school established for the treatment of emotionally distumbed children. Its library inventory was extremely small and its budget for instructional materials was derived primarily from proceeds of bake sales and other Parent Teachers Association activities. Materials acquired under title III and placed on loan in the school were books selected from annotated bibliographies whose subject matter provided insight into the emotional problems of the children.

Not many of ESEA title II projects got off the ground as realistically as that (along with several others) provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

> The Bethel, Alaska bookmobile project continues to stand out as an examplary project, a project that serves 34 outlying day schools via air from a regional library and media center at Bethel.
>
> The Standing Rock reservation in N/S Dakota established a central library and media collection at Fort Yates from which it serves outlying day schools via a bookmobile van. Materials for the central service were purchased from title II funds.
>
> The Bureau of Indian Affairs operates 19 dormitories where students attend public school. This past year two projects were approved to provide library and media in dormitories so that the youngsters may have continued access to print and nonprint materials. This is similar to a home library where children may use these resources during their free time in after-school hours.

To turn from isolated areas to reports to title II projects in urban schools with large minority enrollments, Calif. has furnished a program example:

> The Delevan Drive School, one of 450 elementary schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District, is located in

> Administrative Area H which includes the communities of Lincoln Heights, Highland Park, Eagle Rock, Silver Lake, and Los Feliz. The present facility is new and houses 500 children of whom approximately 36% were minority at the beginning of the 1973-74 school year. The ESEA title II, Phase II project funded in 1974 for this school is designed to assist in the implementation of a highly individualized program to meet the needs of a very diversified group of children in grades K - 6.
>
> Contributing to the diversity of needs in this school are a high transiency rate (37% in 1972); a number of children from low-income homes; and a median IQ score of 96, although 11% of the students are State Identified Gifted Children and an additional 8% are identified as high achievers. Among the objectives which are included in the project are improved reading test scores and establishment of positive attitudes towards reading. Other objectives relate to learning experiences in ethnic and cultural studies and career exploration.

Hawaii reported two especially interesting projects, one from a private school demonstrating creativity, the other from a public school attempting to promote recial harmony by fostering a pride and understanding of heritage. In their own words:

> At the Mid-Pacific Institute, a private school on Oahu, "Foundation for the Future" is the title of a project providing $1,538 in title II funds for printed and audiovisual materials for use by 11th and 12th grade children in a pilot project to explore casual relationships between present and future. The project is planned on an annual basis, but the emphasis will rotate in a two-year cycle, establishing cause and effect relationships in the first year, and examining means and effects manipulating the values of social structures in the second year. It is an interdisciplinary unit incorporating the curricular areas of art, mathematics, social studies science, and the language arts, with planning done by combined staffs of all departments.

Major curricular purposes to be served through this ambitious project are to provide:

(1) a well-planned, well-organized nintial step in curriculum revision leading towards interdisciplinary studies (2) an opportunity for each department to forge beyond the traditional historical-to-present approach... and include instruction in the area most pertinent to students' lives - the future (3) for the exploration of cause and effect -- how will our activities in the 1970s affect our lives in the year 2000.

At Waimanaolo Elementary and Intermediate School, serving children in grades K - 9, a project titled 'Hawaiiana', was funded by title II for $2,000.

A description of the project follows:

> Over 85% of the students in this school are native Hawaiians. The school is located in a pocket where housing has been provided at very low cost to those of Hawaiian heritage. Others in the school are Filipino, Portuguese, Oriental, and Samoan. The majority of the students are educationally deprived. Racial problems have developed in the community, and students from this school have encountered difficulties when they enter high school in nearby Kailua (which is predominantly middle-class Caucasian with many children from service families stationed in the Islands).
>
> Objectives of the program can be summarized thus: (1) To compare and contrast Hawaiian and American mainland cultures; and develop an understanding of the contributions of various ethnic groups that have made Hawaii a 'melting pot of races' (2) To foster pride in themselves and in other ethnic groups in their community by studying past achievements and contributions (3) To give students a deeper appreciation of their own potential and an appreciation of the future development of Hawaii.

Many States reported projects involving students whose reading skills needed sharpening. From Carson City, Nev., came a program typifying how title II funds have used for this purpose. A program objective was designed and implemented to provide high interest/low vocabulary books and for grades 7-8 and fitted in very well with the 'Basic Skills Lab' whose thrust is also directed at remedial reading and language arts deficiencies among high school students.

To close this chapter on the Implementation of Goals, two special purpose grants having Statewide impact were reported from the State of Wash.:

> Television Turns the Pages ($11,704). A Statewide Education Cooperative which provides 'stimulating material to show the benefits of reading as a never ending endeavor'. This program ties in with the State Right to Read effort. The monies were used to purchase 6 thirty-minute television programs bearing the title Cover to Cover. These were put on two-inch video tape and distributed to participating educational television stations.
>
> Professional Materials Library ($30,000). A central collection of 16mm films and other "expensive" media for specific use for teacher in-service programs by any district, school or educational group in the State. The media included are of two basic types: (1) materials that instruct teachers in some specific technique or strategy such as reading techniques or elements of individualized instruction and (2) Exemplary samples of the latest trends in materials for teaching such as simulation and games or involvement films. This project has been specifically designed for staff development and has

had far greater impact than originally anticipated. For the first time the State has a central source for staff development materials. The 12 intermediate school districts have cooperated in bearing the costs of circulation and developing a system for selection and evaluation, and have cooperatively developed a catalog of the materials in the collection.

10. Cumulative Impact of Title II on the Education of Public and Private School Children

Evidence of the cumulative impact of title II on the education of public and private school children and the extent to which the effectiveness or weaknesses of the program could be attributed to various provisions in the State plan of management and program goals was obtained by State department of education staff members through the monitoring of projects, project applications and reports, and in a few instances, formal evaluation based on project objectives.

Subjective assessment of the impact of the program by State department education administrators and supervisors continues to be favorable. Typical of many such assessments is the following, provided by the R.I. title II coordinator:

> All children and teachers have had the use of title II materials. There are strong indications that since all could participate, the program receives strong support from teachers and administrators. The program has been effective because of the following requirements:
>
> - Allocation to children and teachers in all public and private schools
> - Maintenance of effort
> - Involvement of teachers in the selection process
> - Reflection of State needs in the relative need formula
> - Possibility of purchasing both print and nonprint media
>
> One of the weaknesses of the program is the lack of a strong program evaluation.

In Conn., an assessment of the cumulative impact of title II was made by sampling the educational objectives of 13 project applications, three from urban communities, six from suburban, and one from a rural community. The wide-ranging objectives served by these projects are indicative of the pervasive nature of the impact of title II and the contribution that instructional media can make on educational programs:

> To implement a career education program
>
> To provide cultural materials for children from minority groups
>
> To provide new media for children with auditory/perceptual problems

> To encourage individualized study projects in the various disciplines
>
> To involve children in the habit of reading independently for pleasure and information
>
> To enrich opportunities in reading, social studies, and the sciences

In summing it all up, Conn, reported, "Title II is one of the most valuable and effective of the Federal programs because it supports local efforts, is flexible, and most importantly, reaches the children for whom the support is intended".

N.J. reported that the wide participation in title II and its success could be attributed to the ease of understanding the relative need formula, the ability of the State to monitor local effort, the responsibility of the local district for determining its own needs, the freedom to select varying types of media. Del. had this to say in assessing the effects of title II:

> The title II program has provided children in the private schools of the State with new opportunities through the provision of a variety of library resources. In most private schools title II funds have provided support to a very underdeveloped segment of the school program. This is not to suggest that the private schools are unwilling to support their school library/media programs or that they have reduced financial effort, but in general their ability to spend large amounts of money for library resources is less than that of the public schools.
>
> ...
>
> The program has many positive aspects, but also some areas where change should occur. Many of the positive aspects in terms of support for the Right to Read Program through the special purpose grants, and support of the Career Education Program through the basic allocations have been mentioned. The continuous monitoring of projects and the imput of the curriculum staff of the State agency have helped improve the projects in operation and have given guidance to the development of future proposals.

Del.'s State Plan indicates that at least 20% of the school district's title II funds must be spent for print resources. The financial reports of the last several years indicate that districts are spending equal amounts, about half and half, for print and nonprint materials. This is a positive sign and a desirable practice in providing a balanced media program.

Maine credited title II with having a significant impact on the hiring of fully qualified, certified school library staff, and with making librarians at the local level more 'media oriented'. Weaknesses cited included "technical restrictions of the program (whereby manipulative, expendable tactile and raw materials needed in contemporary media programs are excluded), and the difficulty of truly monitoring basic grant programs in Mass.'s 3,000 participating schools". N.H. saw a "slow steady growth pattern for media resources through local support", and credited title II with its maintenance of effort clause as a contributing factor.

Both N.Y. and Pa. stressed the positive as resulting from title II:

> Title II has contributed substantially to the education of public and private school children throughout N.Y. State. Provisions in the State Plan which require that all materials acquired must be school library resources (catalogued and processed as part of a school library or media center) are largely responsible for the establishment of a school library media center in almost every school in the State. Program goals and management have been effective in facilitating the transition from a traditional library to a library media center where resources in all formats are available to children and teachers. The fact that title II expenditures in N.Y. State have been approximately equally divided between traditional print resources and audiovisual school library materials attests to this transition.
>
> The relative need formula for allocation to local education agencies has been successful in ameliorating the inequality of access to learning resources as well as in providing additional materials to support reading programs in those districts where reading achievement is lowest. Local districts have been able to employ new instructional techniques include reading treatment centers in libraries, inservice programs for teachers for reading in the content areas, summer library programs, individualization of instruction, reading motivation through audiovisual resources (particularly for the disadvantaged or handicapped pupil), regional examination centers, continuous achievement monitoring, and bilingual reading programs.
>
> Title II resources have also contributed effectively to the implementation of new and revised curricula developed in the various curriculum areas at the State level. These new programs emphasize a conceptual approach to learning, based on inquiry and requiring the availability of a multiplicity of resources.

Pa. credited title II with the growth of materials collections in both public and non-public schools of the State. The program has also made possible -- even necessitated -- the completion of a draft plan of revision of State standards for school library development. Weaknesses and/or recommendations include a restudy of the relative need formula, a concentration on programs, strengthening of standards, and review of materials selection policies.

All of the States in the Southeastern region report that the cumulative impact of the ESEA title II program on the education of public and private school children has been tremendous. However, the reasons identified are quite varied. One State feels that a 'strong' State plan which casts the State in a definite leadership role has been largely responsible while another State feels that amending the State plan to allow more flexibility and to place more responsibility at the local education agency level has been the strongest factor.

Ala. listed a number of ways in which title II has had an impact on the education program in the State:

1. Many elementary schools have been able to reach State and regional accreditation and many others are consciously striving to attain it. New media programs are encouraged to use the unified approach; this is accomplished by requiring that 25% of the funds be spent for audiovisual materials.

2. Title II allocations have been used in establishing Right to Read centers. These centers have served as an impetus for in-service meetings at the local level. In many instances, local education agencies have subsidized additional college training for personnel.

3. Title II materials have been used by home bound students, students in hospitals, out patients at mental health centers, and by teachers and students in special education programs. Bibliographies have been compiled to be used by such organizations as the League of Women Voters and by teachers attending college who are promoting and supporting efforts toward early childhood education programs.

4. Revisions have been made for upgrading State Standards for Media Specialists and Media Centers with the hope of implementation in the near future. Since 1965 more progress has been made than had been accomplished in the past fifty years. ESEA Title II has definitely spearheaded this progress.

5. Media provided under title II have served as motivation to students in subject areas, providing learning experiences other than those which are textbook oriented.

6. With the increased availablity of a variety of materials, school systems are continually revising curriculum guides which broaden and vary learning experiences. Improved methods of organizing and circulating materials to develop

units of study are evident throughout Ala. There is increased concern about an interest in individualizing instruction in all curriculum areas. Learning centers are being established to improve work-study skills in independent learning experiences. Title II continues to have great impact on the changing and improvement of methods of instruction.

7. The effectiveness of the title II program is reflected in the needs assessment each fall. The most recent survey indicated that fewer than 91 schools are without media programs.

8. It is believed by some that the school library resources provided by title II have had a greater impact in certain areas in improving instructional programs for educationally and economically disadvantaged children than even ESEA Title I has had. Title II materials are used in centers that serve all children without separating them from other users or labeling them in any way. They are the only materials provided with Federal funds which serve all children and teachers in the school system. Comments from teachers and administrators on this aspect of the program are always positive.

The title II program in Fla. has had a very obvious and positive effect on the education of the public ahd private school children of the State. While 78% of the public schools already had established media programs prior to the enactment of title II, these programs have definitely been improved. Title II funds have made up approximately one-fourth of the total funds being spent for library materials, with the remainder coming from both State and local sources. The supplanting prohibitions and the maintenance of effort provision of the program have ensured the continuation of the three-fourths effort. The impact here has been great, especially in this day of competition for the education dollar.

Georgia describes the cumulative impact of title II as follows:

1. Provided media for use by children and teachers in quantities that would not have been available otherwise. One local education agency that eight years ago averaged only three books per pupil now has an average of more than ten books per pupil in every school.

2. Improved the quality of materials. Projects reflect a wider variety of materials crossing a broad spectrum of subject areas at various reading and interest levels.

3. Assisted in developing individualization, inquiry, and independent study programs in both elementary and secondary schools. Local school divisions are moving to the quarter system, greater individualization of instruction, and"research type" teaching, all of which require expanded resources. In many cases the entire staff of a school has become involved in the selection

of media to insure that it will support the instructional program, making the media specialist a viable part of the instructional team.

4. Provided supportive and enrichment materials at various reading and interest levels in all disciplines within the school.

5. Assisted in making available career information for use in grades 1-12.

The cumulative impact of title II on the education of public school children in Ky. has been dramatic. The requirements of the State plan have been instrumental in maintaining a high quality of materials selected and have been supportive of the implications in standards that have resulted in improved staffing, facilities, and programs. In a State with 1,416 public schools there are at present only 40 public elementary schools which do not have the services of a professional librarian at least part-time. Many elementary media centers have been enlarged and remodeled, with the transition from "library" to media center is becoming a reality. At the secondary level, all schools have professional media specialists. Facilities have been changed to permit the use of audiovisual materials in the media center. Title II has provided enough funds to allow for extensive weeding of existing collections and to permit the expansion of media in the newer curriculum areas.

It is harder to determine the impact of title II on the private school sector. The parochial schools have always attempted to maintain libraries. In many cases they have requested the use of audiovisual materials as their equitable share. A very positive aspect of the program has been the close working relationship which has evolved between the public and private schools in planning and sharing the resources provided by title II.

Collections of materials continue to improve in all media centers in S.C., especially in the area of nonprint materials. The number of secondary students involved in independent studies or short-term courses has required that collections be improved in quantity as well as quality. Reference collections are becoming more plentiful, as are subject "centers" and bibliographies. The total expenditure for materials, print and nonprint, in the secondary media centers was $777,250 or $3.39 per student.

In the elementary and middle schools all types and levels of materials continue to be acquired for use of children and teachers in the media centers and the classrooms. The average number of volumes per pupil in elementary media centers is 13.45, while only three elementary and two middle schools do not yet meet the State standard of ten and eight volumes per pupil, respectively. The total amount expended for elementary and middle school media was $919,155, or an average of $2.47 per pupil. Library expenditures in only three schools was less than $2.00 per pupil.

The methods and terms used in providing materials to children and teachers in the State's eligible private schools were the same as those used in providing materials to children and teachers in the public schools. Reports from participating private schools reflected a greater emphasis on increased availability and accessibility of quantities of audiovisual materials.

Local educational agencies in Tenn. have become much more aware of the value and need for a well rounded learning resource materials program as evidenced by increasing local expenditures for this purpose. Title II has supported this through financial assistance and the technical and professional services which have been a part of the program since its inception. Also, during this period a notable change has taken place in school design in order to accommodate the growing media program within the schools. The effectiveness of the title II program is due largely to the provisions of the State plan requiring that allocations of funds be made on a relative need basis and calls attention to the need for expenditures in the various categories of materials. Technical and professional assistance provided local education agencies has helped to make administrators more aware of the needs of and for this program.

Schools in the Mid-Continent region have by-and-large found title II of great value in strengthening school library programs. Idaho, after mentioning several caveats -- "The program is hindered by lack of knowledge on the part of teaching staff about successful utilization of available media", and "the lateness of appropriations necessitates lateness in implementation" -- summed up endeavors by stating that the total media program in Idaho schools has received great impetus and continues to grow. It concluded its report with these words; "With financial help from title II since 1965, all schools have moved towards meeting the quantity guidelines. Some have succeeded but at the expense of retaining obsolete materials".

A State that is basically rural and thinly populated, Mont. has had to cope with small schools operating with limited funds:

> Title II funds have made it possible for many of these small schools, both private and public, to develop new and improved library programs. With the flourishing of multi-media instructional materials, school librarians have had to stretch limited budgets to cover a wide variety of materials. Title II funds have proved very helpful in making possible this wider range of acquisition. Schools have been assisted in their efforts to individualize and humanize instruction because of the availability of supplemental materials through title II.
>
> The relative need formula has been effective in insuring that disadvantaged children as well as those in insolated and thinly populated areas could receive all the necessary library materials to assist them in their development.

In N. Mex.: "Title II has helped improve quality of instruction in both private and public schools, through the additional materials provided by its funding. It also has facilitated the incorporation of small group, individualized and multimedia instruction into school programs of many of our school districts.

From Okal. it was reported:

> "Prior to 1966 practically all of the private schools were without library/media centers. Very few, in fact, had a centralized collection of books and those that existed were inadequate in meeting the myriad needs of students and teachers. Today, a recent survey shows great improvement -- there are only 35% of schools having 10 or fewer books per student, while 41% have 11-19 books, and 24% have over 20 books per student. Weakness still exists in the audiovisual collections, where 31% rate them as moderate, and only 8% as truly good. The schools have clearly made great strides, but it can be seen that there is extensive room for improvement.

In Oklahoma's public schools the report noted the instructional materials made available through title II -- in the earlier years, the print collections were strengthened and now that basic needs have been met in that area, funds are being expended for the non-print media. "More schools are turning to microform to solve the issue of periodicals storage and retrieval. Many non-print materials are being purchased for use by individual students since great emphasis is being placed on individualized library/media programs. There is also evidence that the quality of materials purchased improves each year, with fewer and fewer schools purchasing package deals. Guideline require that 80% of materials must be purchased from approved sources, encouraging schools to make more careful and appropriate selections".

Citing a dramatic increase in the number of librarians and library aides employed since the advent of title II, Tex. credited that happy circumstance tothe availability of title II and other Federal funding for the provision of instructional materials, and on insistence of maintenance of local effort. Since librarians' salaries are not funded under title II, it soon became evident that increased materials demanded that State efforts be bent towards providing professional staffing for their effective organization and use.

Utah reported that a significant weakness of the program for their schools, especially in the small districts operating with limited financial resources, is the maintenance of effort requirement. These small districts have greater deficiencies and needs and at the same time less potential for meeting them. In many instances it has been impossible for them to maintain their expenditures, and consequently have lost their eligibility to receive title II funds. Wyoming, on the other hand, has felt a tremendous impact in terms of financial incentives to more than 95% of its public and private schools, and credits the trend towards the unified media program to title II funding.

States in the Upper Midwest agreed that the cumulative impact of title II has been a general improvement of library media services and materials. From several States came approval for the effect of the maintenance of effort clause on the overall school library program. Minn. stated that

"Title II has made a terrific impact on both public and private schools, not so much "funding-wide", but in forcing schools to assess their needs, and then to appropriate funds to meet these needs". Results in that State show an increase in local funds expenditure from $3.50 per child in 1965 to $7.50 in FY 1974 for the purchase of instructional materials (exclusive of textbooks and encyclopedias).

Wisc. reported:

> Since the start of the title II program in 1965 the number of certified librarians in the State has steadily increased from 942 to 1,220 in FY 1974. Many of the personnel increases have been the direct result of title II and the requirement of many special projects that the school employ a professional librarian or media specialist.

Stating that "The title II effort has helped alert many schools to the importance of a good library program in the total instructional program", Mo. reported that since the inception of the program, the number of employed certified school librarians in the State have increased from 369 to 780.

Several States commented on title II's effect of bringing together various education and professional groups in an effort to develop and strengthen library programs. Kans. addressed itself along these lines:

> The impact of title II in developing unified media programs... has been difficult to separate from media development promoted by the State library Kans. Library Systems, Kans. Association of School Librarians, Kans. Catholic Library Association, and Kans. Library Association, since all of these groups work cooperatively to improve collections, staff, facilities, budgets, and programs. To say that title II funds have been the major factor in this development is easy to substantiate.

Iowa reported on the participation of nonpublic schools and the impact on the private sector in that State:

> Since all print and nonprint materials purchased with title II funds are readily available on an equitable basis from the regional educational media center for use of children and teachers in all schools, public and private, the impact of the program on private students, teachers and schools is similar to that of public schools. All of the regional educational media centers report that teachers and students in private schools participate actively on committees, in in-service education meetings and as users of all available instructional materials.

Responding to requests from local school districts for guidelines in long-range planning, Illi, prepared and distributed Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois, in which is set out a three-phase program of comprehensive media development. Funding under title II was partially based upon the particular phase level of a given district. Since these Standards proved to be primarily quantitative in nature, they are now being revised in the light of qualitative considerations.

From Mich. came a report of an apparently 'skewered' cumulative impact, caused in part by some features built into its relative need formula. According to its formula, 35% of program funds are to be distributed among schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged pupils. Supervisors report that schools attended by these pupils have such extensive collections of instructional materials that the staff are "hard put to spend the money wisely". On the other hand some districts which do not meet these particular criteria, indicate real needs for additional materials. The existing formula does not have a 'floor' allocation which would provide adequate benefits for small districts and small nonpublic schools. The General Accounting Office auditors have suggested that funds be allocated to those schools not meeting school media standards, and for materials in only those areas where deficiencies exist.

The following excerpt from the Mich. report describes the impact of title II on the Macomb County Youth Home, and shows in very revealing terms what the program can and does mean to many children:

> This past year was our second year of receiving title II books, and I feel it has been more successful than the preceding year. The books received were used extensively in our English classes for individual reading, group projects, and reports. Some books were utilized by the music classes in their study of contemporary musicals. A few of the books were so relevant to the lives of our students (who are in detention) that they were read over and over again until finally they fell apart.

States in the Western region provide a broad range of contrasts -- from Calif. which received the largest title II grant in the country to American Samoa with one of the lowest. American Samoa participated in title II for the first time in 1970. For several years prior to that time, major dependence had been placed on instruction by television, there were almost no printed materials available for children to read. In 1972 the reading level of high school graduates averaged at grades 4-6 level in public schools, and at grades 8-10 level in private schools. The variety and quantity of books and other print now available, in addition to trained personnel who are able to guide pupils to appropriate resources, have raised reading scores to grade 6-8 level for public high school graduates, and grades 10-12 level for private high school graduates.

Weaknesses in the program as reported from Ariz. included insufficient personnel to make the required on-site visits, mountains of paperwork that cannot seem to be reduced, inability to purchase equipment and realia with title II monies, and the lateness in the school year of funding. Mitigating all these, however, is Ariz.'s overall assessment:

> The ESEA title II program has been the largest contributing factor to the development of school libraries in the State of Ariz. The pupil achievement resulting from the materials acquisition under title II is difficult to measure from the State level of observation. Results can be seen at the local level where librarians and teachers are working with the students and these materials. Under the Ariz. State Plan, 16mm films and textbooks are excluded from eligibility; thereby releasing more funds for books and other nonprint media and media in other formats.
>
> As a direct result of the program, many schools have opened library centers for the first time. These Federal monies have played a large role in enabling schools to build up nonprint collections and convert their libraries to media centers. Paperbacks, art prints, microfilm and microfiche are finding their way into school libraries where formerly librarians had been reluctant to introduce them because of insufficient funds.

The situation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs resembles that of American Samoa, in that funds seem extremely limited. Yet here again, the Bureau of Indian Affairs reports how helpful the program has been:

> We feel that funds received under title II have brought to many schools supplementary materials that would not have been purchased otherwise. More than this, title II has motivated school administrators, teachers, librarians, media specialists and guidance staff to work cooperatively in assessing needs and developing project applications based on those needs. It is our thinking that title II has generated genuine comprehensive planning. Too often in the past library and media services were limited to secondary schools and the larger elementary schools, with little thought given to the small isolated schools. The title II State Plan requires that priority be given to such schools in the project development process.

Calif., using its title II allocation (the nation's largest) as a leverage, reported that it had effected great strides in its total library program:

> The cumulative impact has raised the average books per student from 4.8 in 1965 to 8.18 in 1974 at the elementary level. At the secondary level the increase has been from 5.3 per student in 1965 to 9.11 in 1974. Corresponding increases have occured in the quantity of 8mm film loops, filmstrips, records, study prints, etc.
>
> From 1971 through 1974, one hundred twenty-seven model libraries were funded (all told, Calif. now has 290 model libraries) and of these, components specially designed to

> meet the needs of gifted children appeared in 23 projects; the needs of low-income areas were considered in 44 projects; the needs of children in certain geographical-cultural areas were specified in 39 projects; the needs of children participating in highly individualized study programs were recognized in 1974 projects; and bilingual-bicultural components appeared in 50 projects. Other components included were year-round schools (5), Early Childhood Education (46) and Career Education (27).
>
> Establishing model libraries that were easily visited by administrators, school board members, media personnel, teachers and interested parents provided a real demonstration of the importance of a well-staffed, adequately stocked media center to the total educational program.

Guam's problems and successes were not typical -- approximately 10,000 books were purchased with FY 1974 title II funds, but because of ordering delays and late releasing of funds, books were still in the process of arriving when its report was filed. Its overall library program did see an increase in number from a total of 14 school libraries with librarians to 35 school libraries, each with a librarian in this fiscal year -- a truly giant step.

The Hawaiian experience, as reported for fiscal year 1974, provided a good case history of a total title II program -- the frustrations and weaknesses, but above all, the values to be reaped from the harvest:

> The cumulative impact of title II on the education of children in the State of Hawaii has been the same for both public and private schools - GREAT.
>
> The revival began in 1967 when the State Standards for school libraries were revised. In the latest revision, that of 1972, greater emphasis was placed on the total media concept. Before title II provided Federal aid to school library programs, the public schools in Hawaii had limited media resources, primarily restricted to filmstrips, phono-records and transparencies. Many of the private schools had no library program at all.
>
> In the State Plan for Hawaii the proportion of funds was allotted to library books and other instructional materials (excluding textbooks). There was no set formula for the division of library books or audiovisual. Schools were free to select those types of media that best met their needs. It soon became apparent that the greatest need was for audiovisual resources in libraries of the public schools. Private schools that did not previously have libraries began working towards providing library services for their children. Many public school librarians went back to the University to take courses in Media Communication, and others included media courses in their work to complete requirements for certification. Many of the private schools not only arranged facilities for library/media centers, but also provided for paid staff to man the centers.

> The relative need criteria were revised, as surveys indicated new trends. It was discovered that the needs were great in all areas of the curriculum and at all grade levels, but there were new units of study written into the curriculum that demanded specific consideration. The title II program attempted to evaluate materials to meet those individual needs...We began to hold regularly scheduled sessions for the preview and evaluation of non-book materials, and publish lists of approved materials for distribution to the schools.
>
> The weaknesses in the program stem from lack of sufficient staff and from procedures that were written into the original State Plan and never changed. In spite of the weaknesses of the program, the uncertainties of Federal funding, the lateness in implementing some of the annual program, it is apparent that title II has had a tremendous impact on the educational program. Commendation from public and private school personnel has been received. Advantages have been extended to all children. Teachers have a wide variety of media to use in their classrooms. Title II resources have enabled librarians to extend their services and contribute a great deal more to the instructional program.

The State of Wash. provided a summing up of the impact of title II on the education of public and private school children that encompasses the pluses and minuses (but mostly the pluses) that ran as a common thread through reports from most of their countrymen:

> Because of the lack of local administrative time, professional library staff and the relatively small amount of money, students and teachers in small and rural schools have not fully participated in the title II program, even though a minimum of $300 is allocated to each eligible LEA. 56 districts, mostly with the the $300 minimum, did not apply during fiscal year 1974. [Nevertheless] ESEA title II has had a dramatic impact on the education of public and private school children in the State of Washington. All K-12 students and teachers in public and private schools were eligible to participate. During fiscal year 1974 257 (of 313) school districts received materials purchased entirely with regular title II funds. In addition 49 school districts and 5 intermediate school districts participated in title II Special Needs Programs (awarded on a competitive basis) which were designed to meet specific needs. These included large and small districts, urban, suburban, rural and culturally and racially disadvantaged areas. The flexibility of title II enabled local and intermediate school districts to develop programs geared to local needs and problems. Boys and girls and teachers in the 'institutional' educational programs throughout the State were also served.
>
> Title II helped provide materials to meet specific and general needs as expressed in the specific needs of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, the goals and objectives expressed by the State Board of Education, the Title III ESEA Assessment of Educational

Needs in the State of Washington, and the Program Priority Survey of local school districts. These included materials for:

1. Individualizing instruction in all areas of the curriculum
2. Implementing vocational education programs
3. Remedial education at all levels
4. "Right to Read" programs
5. Intergroup/intercultural programs
6. Ecology/environmental programs
7. Drug education programs
8. Innovative curriculum programs

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PUBLICATIONS ON THE ESEA TITLE II PROGRAM

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. *Guidelines, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.* (OE-15059-A) Washington, D.C.: The Office, Revised May 1967.

________. *First Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1966, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.* (OE-20108) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

________. *Second Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1967, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.* (OE-20108-67) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

________. *Third Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1968, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.* (OE-20108-68) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

________. *The Federal-State Partnership for Education: The Fifth Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education.* (OE-203050-70) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970. pp.66-67.

________. *School Library Resources, Textbooks,, and Other Instructional Materials, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended, Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1971.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1972.

________. *Descriptive Case Studies of Nine Elementary School Centers in Three Inner Cities, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.* (OE-30021) Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1969.

________. *Emphasis on Excellence in School Media Programs. Descriptive Case Studies, Special-Purpose Grant Programs, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.* (FS 5.220:20123) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

__________. *How ESEA Title II Meets the Educational Needs of Poor Children.* Washington, D.C.: The Office, 1969.

__________. *An Evaluative Survey Report on ESEA Title II, Fiscal Years 1966-1968: Part I: Analysis and Interpretation, Part II: Tables.* 1972.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, Office of Education. *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, P.L. 89-10, as amended; School Library Instructional Materials*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

__________. *School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended, Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1973.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1974.

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR TITLE II, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, FY 197

FORM APPROVED
O.M.B. NO. 51-R1071

(Complete questions 1-7 on a separate sheet or sheets and attach)

1. List the ESEA Title II management goals for the fiscal year in which the funds were spent.

2. Describe briefly how these goals fit into comprehensive State education agency planning.

3. List the ESEA Title II program goals for the fiscal year in which the funds were spent.

4. Describe how the relative need formula reflected program goals.

5. Describe the achievement of each program goal and the degree of attainment of each.

6. Describe briefly 3-5 projects illustrative of the effects of the implementation of your program and management goals and your State plan.

7. Describe the cumulative impact of ESEA Title II on the education of (a) public and (b) private school children of the State. Cite examples, if you wish, from various school levels and types of pupils. To what extent do you attribute the effectiveness or the weaknesses of the program to provisions of the State plan *(such as relative need, proportions of of funds spent on each category of materials, plan for making the materials available, standards)*, to management and program goals?

8-10. Complete the table below.

8. ESEA TITLE II PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

ITEM *(a)*	PUBLIC *(b)*	PRIVATE *(c)*	TOTAL *(b) + (c)* *(d)*
1. Number of schools enrolling participating children and teachers			
2. Number of participants a. Children			
b. Teachers			

9. NUMBER OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARIES *(Media centers)*

ITEM *(a)*	ELEMENTARY *(b)*	SECONDARY *(c)*	TOTAL *(b) + (c)* *(d)*
1. Number of public schools with libraries			
2. Number of public schools without libraries			

10. NUMBER OF STATE ESEA TITLE II ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL *(a)*	NUMBER OF PERSONNEL		TOTAL FTE POSITIONS *(d)*
	FULL-TIME *(b)*	PART-TIME *(c)*	
1. Administrators			
2. Supervisors			
3. Secretaries and clerks			
4. Others			
5. TOTAL			

TITLE AND SIGNATURE OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER	NAME OF STATE

OE FORM 1297-1,

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this form is to report program performance under ESEA Title II during fiscal year 1976. Please submit an original and two copies of this report to the Director, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Definitions

1. "Goals" as used in this form are targets for action or change. The requirements for their achievements can be specified with some certainty.

2. "Management goals" pertain to such facets of administration as staff assignments, disseminating program information, determining allocations, approving project applications.

3. "Program goals" are concerned with such elements as in-service education, strengthening instruction in subject areas, contributing to pupil achievement, supporting curricular change.

4. "Relative need" is described and explained in §117.3 of the ESEA Title II Regulations.

5. "Standards" is defined in §117.1*(k)* of the ESEA Title II Regulations.

6. The three categories of materials *("school library resources," "textbooks," and "other published and printed instructional materials")* are defined in §117.1*(i)* of the ESEA Title II Regulations.

Instructions

8. **Line 1, Column** ***(b)*** – Enter the number of public schools enrolling participating children and teachers. Include special State schools and institutions with elementary and secondary programs. When elementary and secondary grades are combined in one school plant, count as two schools. Line 1, Column *(c)* – Enter the number of private schools enrolling participating children and teachers. Include special private schools with elementary and secondary programs.

   Line 2, Column ***(b)*** – Enter *(A)* the enrollment of children in the participating public schools, and *(B)* the number of the teachers in those schools. For Title II purposes, "teacher" includes principals, guidance counselors, school librarians, and other members of the instructional or supervisory staff. Line 2, Column *(c)* – Enter *(A)* the enrollment of participating children in private schools, and *(B)* the number of teachers in those schools.

9. **Line 1** – Enter the number of public *(b)* elementary schools and *(c)* secondary schools with a school library *(media center).*

   Line 2 – Enter the number of public *(b)* elementary schools and *(c)* secondary schools without a school library *(media center).*

10. **Column** ***(b)*** – Enter the number of full-time staff assigned to State administration of the ESEA Title II program for each personnel category, whether or not salaries were paid from Title II funds.

    Column ***(c)*** – Enter the number of part-time staff.

    Column ***(d)*** – Enter the full-time equivalent *(FTE)* of the total of full- and part-time personnel.

    Example: one full-time secretary *(enter "1" in Column (b));*
    two part-time secretaries [one at 1/4 time, one at 1/3 time] *(enter "2" in Column (c));*

    1.00 + 0.25 + 0.33 = 1.58 FTE *(enter "1.58" in Column (c)).*

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

FORM APPROVED
O.M.B. NO. 51-R1074

TITLE II OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
(FY 197 and FY 197)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

The purpose of these forms is to report the status of ESEA Title II funds for FY 1975 and FY 1976. Submit an original and two copies to U.S. Office of Education, Director, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202.

ITEM 1. Preprinted by the U.S. Office of Education (OE).

ITEM 2. Enter the grant number or other identifying number assigned by the Federal grantor organization.

ITEM 3. Enter the name and complete mailing address, including the ZIP code for the grantee organization.

ITEM 4. Enter the employer identification number assigned by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. If the grantee organization has been assigned a DHEW entity number consisting of the IRS employer identification number prefixed by "1" and suffixed by a two digit number, enter the full DHEW entity number.

ITEM 5. This space is reserved for an account number or other identifying numbers which may be assigned by the grantee.

ITEMS 6 and 7. Mark the appropriate boxes.

ITEMS 8 and 9. Preprinted by OE.

Please read before completing Item 10:
Programs · Functions · Activities

COLUMNS (1)-(3). Definitions of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials are in §117.1 of the ESEA Title II Regulations. Enter the total cost of each category of materials. If actual costs are not available, report estimated amounts from approved applications.

COLUMN (4). Enter the total of estimated costs approved in project applications for ordering, processing, cataloging and delivery.

COLUMN (5). Enter the total administrative costs charged. Include the amount reported in Column (6) and any indirect expense reported in Item 11. The amount reported should not exceed 5 percent of the amount paid to the State during that year or $50,000 whichever is greater.

COLUMN (6). Enter the total State administrative funds transferred to local educational agencies for administrative functions assigned. Do NOT include funds transferred for acquisition of materials.

TOTAL COLUMN. Enter sum of Columns (1)-(6).

ITEM 10. STATUS OF FUNDS. Round all figures to the nearest dollar.

All figures entered on this page include expenditures for materials for children and teachers reported on the continuation sheet.

LINE a. Enter the total outlays reported on Line 10e of the last report. Show zero if this is the initial report.

LINE b. Enter the total gross program outlays for this report period, including disbursements of cash realized as program income. For reports which are prepared on a cash basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements for goods and services, the amount of indirect expense charged, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the amount of cash advances and payments made to contractors and subgrantees. For reports prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements, the amount of indirect expense incurred, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the net increase (or decrease) in the amounts owed by the grantee for goods and other property received and for services performed by employees, contractors, subgrantees, and other payees.

LINE c. Enter "NA".

LINE d. Same as Line b.

LINE e. Enter "NA".

LINE f. Enter "NA".

LINE g. Same as Line d.

LINE h. When the report is prepared on a cash basis, enter the total amount of unpaid obligations for this project or program including unpaid obligations to subgrantees. If the report is prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, enter the amount of undelivered orders and other outstanding obligations. Do NOT include any amounts that have been included on Lines a through g. On the final report, Line h should have a zero balance.

LINE i. Enter "NA".

LINE j. Same as Line h.

LINE k. Enter the sum of the amounts shown on Lines g and j. If the report is final, the report should not contain any unpaid obligations.

LINE l. Enter the total cumulative amount of Federal funds authorized (the allotment). Enter under the Total Column only.

LINE m. Enter the unobligated balance of Federal funds. This amount should be the difference between Lines k and l. Make entries in the Total Column only.

ITEM 11. INDIRECT EXPENSE

a. Type of rate – Mark the appropriate box.

b. Rate – Enter the rate in effect during the reporting period.

c. Base – Enter the amount of the base to which the rate was applied.

d. Total Amount – Enter the total amount of indirect cost charged during the report period.

e. Federal Share – Enter the amount of the Federal share charged during the report period.

If more than one rate was applied during the project period, include a separate schedule which shows the bases against which the indirect cost rates were applied, the respective indirect rates, the month, day, and year the indirect rates were in effect, amounts of indirect expense charged to the project, and the Federal share of indirect expense charged to the project to date. (See Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87 which contains principles for determining allowable costs of grants and contracts with State and local governments.)

ITEM 12. Enter in Column (b) the total Statewide outlays and expenditures for school library resources the year prior to the reporting year:

Line 1. From State and local school funds (participating districts and schools only).

Line 2. From private school funds (private schools with participants only).

OE FORM 1287.

ITEM 13. Complete the certification before submitting this report. (The authorized official as designated in the State plan is the one to submit official materials.)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE CONTINUATION SHEET FOR ESEA TITLE II

ITEM 1. Preprinted by Office of Education.

ITEMS 2 THROUGH 9. Enter the same information as on the first page.

ITEM 10. STATUS OF FUNDS. Round all figures to the nearest dollar.

All entries on this sheet should be for materials acquired for the use [illegible] children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools, and should be included in the totals entered on the first page. If it is not possible to report separately for public and private, indicate the reasons. For definitions of the categories of materials and for outlays and unpaid obligations, refer to the instructions for the first page.

If these figures are not available, enter amounts from approved applications. Complete Line k only.

LINE k. Enter the total outlays and unpaid obligations for the reporting period for materials to be used by private school participants:

Enter the cost of materials for private school participants as school library resources (Column (2)), and as other instructional materials (Column (3)).

Enter in Column (4) the amount for ordering, delivery, processing, and cataloging materials for use by private school participants from approved project applications.

TOTAL COLUMN. Enter the total of Columns (1) through (4).

OMB NO. 29-R0224

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

1. FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT
U.S. Office of Education, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources

2. FEDERAL GRANT NO. OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NO.
ESEA II (Public & Private) FY 7 CAN: 6200217

3. NAME AND ADDRESS OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATION

4. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.

5. GRANTEE ACCOUNT NO. OR IDENTIFYING NO.

6. FINAL REPORT
☐ YES
☐ NO

7. BASIS OF REPORT
☐ CASH
☐ ACCRUED EXPENDITURES

8. PROJECT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year)
FROM 7 | 1 | 75 TO 9 | 30 | 76

9. REPORT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year)
FROM 7 | 1 | 75 TO 9 | 30 | 76

10. STATUS OF FUNDS

	PROGRAMS - FUNCTIONS - ACTIVITIES						
	(1) School Library Resources	(2) Textbooks	(3) Other Instructional Materials	(4) Processing and Cataloging	(5) Administration	(6) Administrative funds transferred to LEA's	TOTAL
a. Total outlays previously reported							
b. Total program outlays this period							
c. LESS: Program income credits							
d. Net program outlays this period							
e. Total program outlays to date							
f. LESS: Non-Federal share of program outlays							
g. Total Federal share of program outlays							
h. Total unpaid obligations							
i. LESS: Non-Federal share of unpaid obligations							
j. Federal share of unpaid obligations							
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unpaid obligations							
l. Total Federal funds authorized							
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds							

11. INDIRECT EXPENSE: a. TYPE OF RATE (Mark box)
☐ PROVISIONAL ☐ FINAL
☐ PREDETERMINED ☐ FIXED

b. RATE

c. BASE

d. TOTAL AMOUNT

e. FEDERAL SHARE

12. REMARKS (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

EXPENDITURES FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES

FUND SOURCE (a)	AMOUNT (b)
1. STATE AND LOCAL	$
2. PRIVATE SCHOOL FUNDS	$
TOTAL	$

13. Certification - I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purpose set forth in the grant award documents.

NAME

TITLE

TELEPHONE
AREA CODE
NUMBER
EXT.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

DATE REPORT IS SUBMITTED

HEW-601T

OMB NO 29-R0224

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT	1. FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT U.S. Office of Education, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources				2. FEDERAL GRANT NO. OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NO. ESEA II (Private) FY 7[illegible] CAN: 62002[illegible]
3. NAME AND ADDRESS OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATION	4. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.	5. GRANTEE ACCOUNT NO. OR IDENTIFYING NO.	6. FINAL REPORT ☐ YES ☐ NO		7. BASIS OF REPORT ☐ CASH ☐ ACCRUED EXPENDITURES
	8. PROJECT PERIOD *(Month, Day, Year)* FROM 7 | 1 | 75	TO 9 | 30 | 76	9. REPORT PERIOD *(Month, Day, Year)* FROM 7 | 1 | 75		TO 9 | 30 | 76

10. STATUS OF FUNDS	PROGRAMS - FUNCTIONS - ACTIVITIES						
	(1) School Library Resources	(2) Textbooks	(3) Other Instructional Materials	(4) Processing and Cataloging	(5)	(6)	*TOTAL*
a. Total outlays previously reported							
b. Total program outlays this period							
c. LESS: Program income credits							
d. Net program outlays this period							
e. Total program outlays to date							
f. LESS: Non-Federal share of program outlays							
g. Total Federal share of program outlays							
h. Total unpaid obligations							
i. LESS: Non-Federal share of unpaid obligations							
j. Federal share of unpaid obligations							
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unpaid obligations							
l. Total Federal funds authorized							
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds							

11. INDIRECT EXPENSE: a. TYPE OF RATE *(Mark box)* ☐ PROVISIONAL ☐ FINAL ☐ PREDETERMINED ☐ FIXED		12. REMARKS *(Attach additional sheets if necessary)*	13. Certification - I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purpose set forth in the grant award documents.		
b. RATE	c. BASE		NAME TITLE	TELEPHONE AREA CODE	NUMBER EXT.
d. TOTAL AMOUNT	e. FEDERAL SHARE		SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL		DATE REPORT IS SUBMITTED

HEW-601T

TABLES

TABLE 1. Funds available and funds expended for acquisition and State administration and percent of total expended for administration under ESEA title II: Fiscal Year 1973

State or other area (1)	Allotment (2)	Acquisitions (3)	State Administration (4)	Total Expenditures (5)	Percent of Allotment Expended for State Administration (6)	Percent of Allotment Expended (7)	Carryover (8)
	$100,000,000	$65,401,955	$3,756,773	$69,158,728	3.76	69.14	$30,841,272
Alabama	1,576,446	1,182,468	63,543	1,246,011	4.03	79.03	330,435
Alaska	154,768	118,557	13,972	132,529	9.03	85.63	22,239
Arizona	880,504	511,687	8,295	519,982	0.94	59.16	360,522
Arkansas	899,666	646,577	33,890	680,467	5.24	75.63	219,199
California	9,555,979	7,166,790	259,509	7,426,299	2.72	77.71	2,129,680
Colorado	1,114,779	943,260	45,899	989,159	4.12	88.73	125,620
*Connecticut	1,474,526	1,341,619	74,026	1,415,645	5.02	96.00	58,881
Delaware	284,778	205,907	25,261	231,167	8.87	81.17	53,610
*District of Columbia	316,966	241,966	50,000	291,966	15.77	92.11	25,000
Florida	2,913,723	93,249	76,954	170,203	2.64	5.84	2,743,520
Georgia	2,138,801	1,826,857	0	1,826,857	0.00	85.41	311,944
Hawaii	395,231	225,601	23,610	249,211	5.97	63.05	146,020
*Idaho	359,913	304,523	40,390	344,913	11.22	95.83	15,000
Illinois	5,372,023	0	241,774	241,774	100.00	4.50	5,130,249
Indiana	2,567,276	2,456,720	8,866	2,465,586	0.35	96.02	101,690
Iowa	1,409,424	1,208,076	60,406	1,268,482	4.29	90.00	140,942
Kansas	1,052,428	1,022,647	25,171	1,047,818	2.39	99.56	4,610
Kentucky	1,502,616	1,292,706	59,648	1,352,354	3.97	89.99	150,262
*Louisiana	1,839,047	1,564,142	91,000	1,655,142	4.95	89.99	183,905
*Maine	511,820	411,347	35,000	446,347	6.84	87.20	65,473
*Maryland	1,976,418	1,837,597	98,821	1,936,418	5.00	97.97	40,000
Massachusetts	2,653,547	2,524,138	92,594	2,616,732	3.49	98.61	36,815
Michigan	4,607,269	272,306	133,807	406,113	2.90	8.81	4,201,156
Minnesota	1,989,124	1,699,737	52,101	1,751,838	2.62	88.07	237,286
Mississippi	1,051,644	7,183	48,602	55,785	4.26	5.30	995,859
Missouri	2,276,926	2,163,080	113,846	2,276,926	5.00	100.00	0
Montana	361,392	0	31,293	31,293	100.00	8.65	330,099
Nebraska	709,282	248,162	50,302	298,464	7.09	42.07	410,818
Nevada	251,573	199,984	26,432	226,416	10.51	90.00	25,157
New Hampshire	362,994	283,470	31,890	315,360	8.79	86.87	47,634
New Jersey	3,396,759	2,094,056	94,762	2,188,818	2.79	64.43	1,207,941
*New Mexico	567,813	482,813	30,000	512,813	5.28	90.31	55,000
New York	8,159,503	6,229,876	356,472	6,586,348	4.31	80.71	1,573,155
North Carolina	2,299,340	1,902,966	46,925	1,949,891	2.04	84.80	349,449
North Dakota	305,974	266,960	11,590	278,550	3.79	91.03	27,424
Ohio	5,282,833	5,005,196	77,654	5,082,850	1.47	96.21	199,983
Oklahoma	1,212,516	984,462	78,342	1,062,804	6.46	87.65	149,712
*Oregon	972,750	822,866	50,000	872,866	5.14	89.73	99,884
Pennsylvania	5,527,967	4,245,465	237,642	4,483,107	4.30	81.09	1,044,860
Rhode Island	441,064	185,552	27,236	212,788	6.18	48.24	228,276
South Carolina	1,250,369	1,184,898	62,518	1,247,416	5.00	99.76	2,953
South Dakota	339,742	221,531	43,229	264,760	12.72	77.92	74,982
Tennessee	1,772,102	1,407,791	25,199	1,432,990	1.42	80.86	339,112
Texas	5,596,863	974,921	244,468	1,219,389	4.37	21.78	4,377,474
Utah	584,952	477,680	47,127	524,807	8.06	89.71	60,145
Vermont	224,964	101,743	26,256	127,999	11.67	56.89	96,965
Virginia	2,154,844	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	2,154,844
Washington	1,650,100	1,558,994	77,727	1,636,721	4.71	99.18	13,379
West Virginia	783,532	733,532	50,000	783,532	6.38	100.00	0
Wisconsin	2,305,507	2,182,735	115,308	2,298,043	5.00	99.67	7,464
Wyoming	170,599	23,085	22,869	45,954	13.41	26.93	124,645
American Samoa	30,000	30,000	0	30,000	0.00	100.00	0
Guam	81,342	81,342	0	81,342	0.00	100.00	0
Puerto Rico	2,045,600	1,948,067	97,533	2,045,600	4.77	100.00	0
*Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	96,064	81,064	5,000	86,064	5.20	89.59	10,000
*Virgin Islands	43,693	38,693	5,000	43,693	11.44	100.00	0
Bureau of Indian Affairs	142,325	135,311	7,014	142,325	4.93	100.00	0

*Estimated

Table 2. **Funds available and funds expended for acquisition and State administration and percent allotment expended for administration under ESEA title II: Fiscal Year 1974**

	Allotment	Acquisitions	State Administration	Allotment Expended for State Administration	Total Expenditures	Percent Allotment Expended	Carryover
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$90,250,000	$ 71,199,228	$ 2,976,003	3.30	$74,175,231	82.19	$16,074,769
Alabama	1,417,852	1,136,228	4,457	0.0	1,140,870	80.4	276,982
Alaska	146,657	47,536	15,000	10.2	62,536	38.5	84,121
Arizona	833,587	817,092	16,495	19.7	833,587	100.0	-0-
Arkansas	804,423	-0-	24,465	3.0	24,465	3.0	779,958
California	8,536,517	1,578,792	266,590	3.1	1,845,382	21.6	6,691,135
Colorado	1,026,488	997,406	29,082	2.8	1,026,488	100.0	-0-
Connecticut	1,335,140	993,816	13,110	0.9	1,006,926	75.4	328,214
Delaware	260,008	206,193	10,000	3.8	216,193	83.1	43,815
District of Columbia	279,769	235,425	44,344	15.8	279,769	100.0	-0-
Florida	2,704,985	2,555,228	149,757	5.5	2,704,985	100.0	-0-
Georgia	1,911,403	1,815,833	-0-	0.0	1,815,833	95.0	95,570
Hawaii	360,767	93,440	40,000	11.0	133,440	36.9	227,327
Idaho	327,988	295,080	32,908	10.0	327,988	100.0	-0-
Illinois	4,876,093	4,850,550	25,543	5.2	4,876,093	100.0	-0-
Indiana	2,307,156	1,874,494	1,558	0.0	1,876,052	81.3	431,104
Iowa	1,255,562	1,196,954	58,608	4.6	1,255,562	100.0	-0-
Kansas	930,912	894,783	22,033	2.3	916,786	98.4	14,126
Kentucky	1,356,508	1,293,554	62,954	4.6	1,356,508	100.0	-0-
Louisiana	1,669,590	1,506,804	83,480	5.0	1,590,284	95.2	79,306
Maine	463,249	433,249	30,000	6.4	463,249	100.0	-0-
Maryland	1,787,959	1,725,959	62,000	3.4	1,787,959	100.0	-0-
Massachusetts	2,429,112	2,315,139	42,951	1.8	2,358,090	97.0	71,022
Michigan	4,198,424	1,519,150	47,150	1.1	1,566,300	37.3	2,632,124
Minnesota	1,777,743	1,738,874	38,869	2.1	1,777,743	100.0	-0-
Mississippi	936,130	87,463	48,277	5.1	135,740	14.5	800,390
Missouri	2,021,406	1,920,330	101,070	4.9	2,021,400	99.5	6
Montana	326,976	221,721	-0-	0.0	221,721	67.8	105,259
Nebraska	643,619	346,581	26,931	4.1	373,512	5.8	270,107
Nevada	230,488	206,382	18,106	7.8	224,488	97.3	6,000
New Hampshire	335,975	288,760	47,215	14.0	335,975	100.0	-0-
New Jersey	3,085,657	2,962,206	89,902	2.3	3,052,108	80.1	33,549
New Mexico	516,306	135,593	-0-	0.0	135,593	26.2	380,713
New York	7,423,067	7,137,628	285,439	3.8	7,423,067	100.0	-0-
North Carolina	2,037,649	1,813,849	25,101	1.2	1,838,950	90.2	198,699
North Dakota	270,752	230,804	282	0.0	231,086	85.3	39,666
Ohio	4,775,569	4,576,791	6,024	0.0	4,582,815	95.9	192,754
Oklahoma	1,086,694	1,000,533	51,135	4.7	1,051,668	96.7	35,026
Oregon	872,473	822,295	49,571	5.6	871,866	99.9	607
Pennsylvania	5,000,836	4,624,976	241,975	4.8	4,866,951	97.3	133,885
Rhode Island	401,728	197,494	47,604	11.8	245,098	61.0	156,630
South Carolina	1,141,558	1,059,207	57,078	5.0	1,115,285	97.6	26,273
South Dakota	303,545	272,085	861	2.8	272,946	89.9	30,599
Tennessee	1,587,853	1,277,082	3,638	0.0	1,280,720	80.6	307,133
Texas	4,979,429	3,191,196	226,937	4.5	3,418,133	68.6	1,561,296
Utah	528,228	469,745	47,000	8.8	516,745	97.8	11,483
Vermont	206,217	178,695	27,522	13.3	206,217	100.0	-0-
Virginia	1,928,041	1,825,639	96,402	4.9	1,922,041	99.6	6,000
Washington	1,461,184	1,393,324	67,860	4.6	1,461,184	100.0	-0-
West Virginia	710,237	661,337	48,900	6.8	710,237	100.0	-0-
Wisconsin	2,086,738	1,982,402	104,336	4.9	2,086,738	100.0	-0-
Wyoming	152,533	127,279	21,220	13.8	148,499	97.3	4,034
American Samoa	30,000	28,420	-0-	0.0	28,420	94.7	1,580
Guam	74,769	74,769	-0-	0.0	74,769	100.0	-0-
Puerto Rico	1,828,294	1,736,879	91,415	5.0	1,828,294	100.0	-0-
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	86,589	65,361	2,948	3.4	68,309	78.8	18,280
Virgin Islands	56,339	41,339	15,000	2.6	56,339	100.0	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	125,229	120,299	4,930	3.9	125,229	100.0	-0-

Table 3. Funds available and funds expended for State Administration and for acquisitions under ESEA Title II Programs: Fiscal Year 1966 -1976

Fiscal Year	Allotment	Administration Amount	Administration Percent	Acquisitions Amount 1/	Acquisitions Percent	Total Expenditure	Percent of Allotment Expended
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1966	$100,000,000	$2,049,362	2.1	$95,298,079	98.0	$97,347,441	97.3
1967	102,000,000	3,885,118	3.8	95,745,032	96.2	99,630,150	97.6
1968	99,234,000	4,427,912	4.4	94,024,821	95.5	98,452,733	99.2
1969	50,000,000	3,047,522	6.1	46,153,184	93.8	49,200,706	98.4
1970 2/	42,500,000	2,431,133	6.5	34,913,640	93.6	37,344,773	87.8
1971	80,000,000	3,281,932	4.1	67,343,321	95.9	70,625,253	95.9
1972	90,000,000	3,217,274	3.9	78,286,154	96.1	81,503,428	90.5
1973	100,000,000	3,756,773	5.4	65,401,958	94.6	69,158,731	67.1
1974	90,250,000	2,976,003	4.0	71,199,228	96.0	74,175,321	82.1
1975 3/	95,250,000	4,000,000	4.3	89,000,000	95.7	93,000,000	97.6
1976 3/	45,951,951	4,000,000	9.4	38,735,314	90.6	42,735,314	93.0
Total	$895,185,951	$37,073,029	4.6	$776,100,731	95.4	$813,173,760	90.8

_/ Includes expenditures for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering

_/ In Fiscal Years 1970-1976, a statutory amendment permitted carryover to the next year of unexpended funds

_/ Expenditures estimated

TABLE 4. Number of State educational agency staff assigned to ESEA title II programs in full-time equivalents: Fiscal Year 1974

	States and other areas (1)	Adminis-tration (2)	Supervisor (3)	Clerical Personnel (4)	Other Personnel (5)	Total (6)
	Totals	52.8	67.3	134.6	21.2	276.0
	Total 50 States and D.C.					
1	Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
2	Alaska	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.2
3	Arizona	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
4	Arkansas	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
5	California	1.0	6.9	8.0	1.0	16.9
6	Colorado	-	-	-	-	-
7	Connecticut	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
8	Delaware	1.0	0.1	0.5	0.0	1.6
9	District of Columbia	-	-	-	-	-
10	Florida	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.0	4.5
11	Georgia	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
12	Hawaii	1.0	0.0	3.0	1.0	5.0
13	Idaho	1.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
14	Illinois	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	10.0
15	Indiana	1.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
16	Iowa	0.6	1.1	1.0	0.1	2.8
17	Kansas	0.5	1.0	2.0	0.3	3.8
18	Kentucky	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	6.0
19	Louisiana	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
20	Maine	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	2.5
21	Maryland	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.5
22	Massachusetts	1.0	5.0	5.8	1.0	12.8
23	Michigan	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.5
24	Minnesota	0.5	1.0	3.5	0.5	5.5
25	Mississippi	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
26	Missouri	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
27	Montana	0.1	0.2	1.0	0.0	1.3
28	Nebraska	3.7	0.0	2.4	0.0	6.1
29	Nevada	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.7
30	New Hampshire	0.2	2.0	1.3	0.0	3.5
31	New Jersey	1.0	4.0	1.0	0.0	6.0
32	New Mexico	0.3	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.3
33	New York	7.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	21.0
34	North Carolina	1.8	0.0	6.0	0.0	7.8
35	North Dakota	1.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	4.0
36	Ohio	0.7	4.1	4.0	0.0	8.8
37	Oklahoma	1.0	1.5	2.2	0.0	4.7
38	Oregon	0.5	1.0	1.2	0.0	2.7
39	Pennsylvania	1.0	4.0	7.5	8.0	20.5
40	Rhode Island	1.0	0.1	1.3	0.0	2.4
41	South Carolina	0.0	2.5	1.7	0.0	4.2
42	South Dakota	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.7
43	Tennessee	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	4.0
44	Texas	6.6	0.0	9.9	0.0	16.5
45	Utah	1.0	1.0	4.0	0.0	6.0
46	Vermont	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	1.5
47	Virginia	0.0	2.0	3.7	0.8	6.5
48	Washington	0.6	1.1	1.1	0.5	3.3
49	West Virginia	-	-	-	-	-
50	Wisconsin	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	5.0
51	Wyoming	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.9
	Total Outlying Areas					
52	American Samoa	1.0	8.0	2.0	0.0	11.0
53	Guam	0.2	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.2
54	Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-
55	Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	0.4	0.5	1.0	1.0	2.9
56	Virgin Islands	-	-	-	-	-
57	BIA	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.8

TABLE 5. Number of Professional and Nonprofessional Positions Assigned to ESEA Title II Programs in State Educational Agencies in Full-Time Equivalents: Fiscal Year 1966 - 1974

FISCAL YEAR	NUMBER OF POSITIONS		
	PROFESSIONAL	NONPROFESSIONAL	TOTAL
1966	119.1	123.3	242.4
1967	157.5	208.0	365.5
1968	165.6	215.5	381.1
1969	-	-	-
1970	91.6	139.9	231.5
1971	107.2	183.4	290.6
1972	128.8	173.1	301.9
1973	118.9	161.9	280.8
1974	120.1	155.9	276.0
TOTAL	1008.8	1361.0	2369.8

1/ Information not available
2/ Estimated

TABLE 6. NUMBER OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL CHILDREN AND TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN ESEA TITLE II: FISCAL YEAR 1974

State or Other Area	NUMBER OF CHILDREN			NUMBER OF TEACHERS		
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
TOTALS	37,303,038	3,842,723	40,597,751	1,547,769	160,799	1,708,568
Alabama	761,070	22,610	783,680	32,981	1,343	34,324
Alaska	6,045	0	6,045	396	0	396
Arizona	416,271	20,969	437,240	17,466	1,050	18,516
Arkansas	461,761	8,870	470,631	21,777	370	22,147
California	4,314,402	261,843	4,576,245	187,632	13,504	201,136
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	605,272	123,919	729,191	33,452	5,180	38,632
Delaware	116,624	13,485	130,109	5,467	665	6,132
District of Columbia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	1,315,721	97,670	1,413,391	64,633	5,207	69,840
Georgia	705,471	20,776	726,247	31,338	1,173	32,511
Hawaii	175,194	25,588	200,782	7,848	1,298	9,146
Idaho	186,504	4,228	190,732	9,995	232	10,227
Illinois	2,164,465	419,354	2,583,819	100,957	16,385	117,342
Indiana	1,203,716	66,696	1,270,412	41,124	1,721	42,845
Iowa	631,132	64,432	695,564	35,337	3,317	38,654
Kansas	422,077	28,147	450,224	25,500	1,493	26,993
Kentucky	704,397	54,109	758,506	32,795	2,921	35,716
Louisiana	870,468	156,666	1,027,134	40,796	8,161	48,957
Maine	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	912,640	94,737	1,007,377	77,340	4,006	81,346
Massachusetts	940,082	149,549	1,089,631	56,687	8,709	65,396
Michigan	2,128,941	184,598	2,313,539	-	-	-
Minnesota	949,600	106,392	1,055,992	51,553	6,442	57,995
Mississippi	519,786	20,362	540,148	8,318	920	9,238
Missouri	994,438	116,357	1,110,795	49,380	5,818	55,198
Montana	193,956	8,987	202,943	8,297	440	8,737
Nebraska	307,097	41,397	348,494	-	2,097	2,097
Nevada	62,618	2,707	65,325	1,970	89	2,059
New Hampshire	165,267	17,550	182,817	8,440	927	9,367
New Jersey	1,455,793	239,884	1,695,677	88,468	12,413	100,881
New Mexico	273,305	12,971	286,276	16,701	1,264	17,965
New York	2,070,128	561,386	2,631,514	106,653	25,976	132,629
North Carolina	913,397	16,434	929,831	43,584	1,016	44,600
North Dakota	139,518	11,340	150,858	7,548	545	8,093
Ohio	1,517,856	34,051	1,551,907	52,478	13,713	66,191
Oklahoma	548,010	12,924	560,934	28,630	896	29,526
Oregon	471,201	18,287	489,488	24,232	520	24,752
Pennsylvania	1,183,777	443,995	1,627,772	-	-	-
Rhode Island	31,768	1,032	32,800	1,655	34	1,689
South Carolina	463,913	6,842	470,755	21,416	312	21,728
South Dakota	157,522	13,949	171,471	9,300	1,088	10,388
Tennessee	765,979	15,665	781,644	34,935	909	35,844
Texas	1,199,144	80,133	1,279,277	-	-	-
Utah	305,800	2,798	308,598	13,445	127	13,572
Vermont	45,257	2,216	47,473	2,478	197	2,675
Virginia	1,080,591	36,601	1,117,192	56,378	-	56,378
Washington	772,810	41,122	813,932	32,477	2,200	34,677
West Virginia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wisconsin	964,159	146,282	1,110,441	47,239	5,675	52,914
Wyoming	77,950	2,317	80,267	4,656	109	4,765
American Samoa	8,123	1,605	9,728	383	51	434
Guam	27,025	4,152	31,177	1,275	-	1,275
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trust Territories	33,365	4,739	38,104	1,604	286	1,890
Virgin Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bureau of Indians Affairs	13,622	-	13,622	755	-	755

Table 7. Number of Public and Private Schools Enrolling Children Participating in ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974

	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS		
State or other Area	Public	Private	Total
Totals	74,480	13,396	87,876
Alabama	1,381	80	1,461
Alaska	24	0	24
Arizona	582	79	661
Arkansas	1,152	42	1,194
California	7,062	1,054	8,116
Colorado	-	-	-
Connecticut	1,348	302	1,650
Delaware	145	41	186
District of Columbia	-	-	-
Florida	1,663	385	2,048
Georgia	1,086	61	1,147
Hawaii	224	65	307
Idaho	554	40	594
Illinois	5,229	995	6,224
Indiana	2,168	291	2,459
Iowa	1,953	309	2,262
Kansas	1,430	148	1,578
Kentucky	1,436	228	1,664
Louisiana	1,438	464	1,902
Maine	-	-	-
Maryland	1,334	107	1,441
Massachusetts	1,729	495	2,224
Michigan	3,858	644	4,502
Minnesota	1,829	471	2,300
Mississippi	1,083	70	1,153
Missouri	2,109	424	2,533
Montana	487	62	549
Nebraska	776	201	977
Nebraska	162	13	175
New Hampshire	422	60	482
New Jersey	2,319	615	2,934
New Mexico	612	68	680
New York	2,526	1,375	3,901
North Carolina	1,614	92	1,706
North Dakota	682	53	735
Ohio	3,201	855	4,056
Oklahoma	1,448	77	1,525
Oregon	1,133	66	1,199
Pennsylvania	4,320	1,592	5,912
Rhode Island	59	4	63
South Carolina	784	26	810
South Dakota	902	126	1,028
Tennessee	1,701	67	1,768
Texas	3,587	273	3,860
Utah	549	10	559
Vermont	148	15	163
Virginia	1,769	128	1,897
Washington	1,622	204	1,826
West Virginia	-	-	-
Wisconsin	2,255	567	2,822
Wyoming	192	9	201
American Samoa	31	6	37
Guam	35	11	46
Puerto Rico	-	-	-
Trust Territories	245	26	271
Virgin Islands	-	-	-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	64	-	64

Table 8. **Expenditures for instructional materials** loaned to children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools; costs of ordering, cataloging, processing, and delivering materials; under ESEA title II: Fiscal Year 1973

State or other area	Instructional Materials: Public: Cost	Instructional Materials: Public: Percent	Instructional Materials: Private: Cost	Instructional Materials: Private: Percent	Total Expenditures for materials (Col. 2+4)	Ordering, processing, cataloging, delivering: Cost	Ordering, processing, cataloging, delivering: Percent of total acquisitions	Total Acquisitions (Col. 6+7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	$58,726,340	93.72	$3,934,754	6.28	$62,661,094	$2,740,864	4.19	$65,401,958
Alabama	1,135,554	97.21	32,550	2.79	1,168,104	14,364	1.22	1,182,468
Alaska	113,170	95.45	--	--	113,170	5,387	4.55	118,557
+Arizona	511,687	100.00	--	--	511,687	0	0.00	511,687
+Arkansas	646,577	100.00	--	--	646,577	0	0.00	646,577
California	5,925,734	94.17	366,707	5.83	6,292,441	874,349	12.20	7,166,790
Colorado	866,825	97.76	20,014	5.24	886,839	56,421	5.98	943,260
*Connecticut	1,109,394	83.00	227,225	17.00	1,336,619	5,000	0.38	1,341,619
Delaware	172,026	88.32	23,160	11.78	195,186	10,721	5.22	205,907
*District of Columbia	220,191	91.00	21,775	9.00	241,966	0	0.00	241,966
Florida	60,990	67.96	28,742	32.04	89,732	3,517	3.77	93,249
+Georgia	1,726,348	100.00	--	--	1,726,348	100,509	5.35	1,826,857
+Hawaii	181,609	100.00	-	--	181,609	43,992	19.50	225,601
*Idaho	281,697	94.95	14,826	5.0[illegible]	296,523	8,000	2.64	304,523
Illinois	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Indiana	2,215,829	93.89	144,143	[illegible].10	2,359,972	96,748	3.93	2,456,720
+Iowa	1,136,343	100.00	--	--	1,136,343	71,733	5.94	1,208,076
Kansas	947,705	95.94	40,057	4.06	987,762	34,885	3.42	1,022,647
Kentucky	1,148,157	92.31	95,59[illegible]	7.69	1,243,751	48,955	6.80	1,292,706
*Louisiana	1,237,497	82.00	271,6[illegible]5	18.00	1,509,142	55,000	3.51	1,564,142
*Maine	370,212	92.24	31,[illegible]35	7.76	401,347	10,000	2.43	411,347
*Maryland	1,533,032	85.99	249,565	14.01	1,782,597	55,000	2.99	1,837,597
Massachusetts	2,060,474	84.77	369,954	15.23	2,430,428	93,710	3.72	2,524,138
Michigan	223,572	82.10	48,734	18.00	272,306	0	0.00	272,306
+Minnesota	1,648,745	100.00	--	--	1,648,745	50,992	3.00	1,699,737
+Mississippi	4,660	100.00	--	--	4,660	2,523	35.13	7,183
+Missouri	2,098,188	100.00	--	--	2,098,188	64,892	3.00	2,163,080
Montana	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Nebraska	189,530	80.28	46,542	19.72	236,072	12,090	4.88	248,162
+Nevada	195,794	100.00	--	--	195,794	4,190	22.81	199,984
+New Hampshire	249,455	100.00	--	--	249,455	34,015	34.95	283,470
New Jersey	1,707,166	83.01	349,198	16.99	2,056,364	37,692	0.53	2,094,056
*New Mexico	438,804	93.99	28,009	6.01	466,813	16,000	3.31	482,813
New York	5,042,362	87.85	697,339	12.15	5,739,701	490,175	7.88	6,229,876
North Carolina	1,850,772	98.31	31,755	1.69	1,882,527	20,439	1.09	1,902,966
North Dakota	247,844	93.40	17,496	6.60	265,340	1,620	0.62	266,960
+Ohio	5,005,196	100.00	--	--	5,005,196	0	0.00	5,005,196
Oklahoma	962,086	98.07	18,917	1.93	981,003	3,459	0.36	984,462
Oregon	785,956	95.51	36,910	4.49	822,866	0	0.00	822,866
+Pennsylvania	4,118,101	100.00	--	--	4,118,101	127,364	3.01	4,245,465
Rhode Island	149,652	84.66	27,114	15.33	176,766	8,786	4.74	185,552
+South Carolina	1,114,861	100.00	--	--	1,114,861	70,037	5.92	1,184,898
+South Dakota	220,559	100.00	--	--	220,559	972	0.44	221,531
Tennessee	1,279,720	93.58	87,627	6.42	1,367,347	40,444	2.88	1,407,791
+Texas	973,499	100.00	--	--	973,499	1,422	0.15	974,921
+Utah	477,680	100.00	--	--	477,680	0	0.00	477,680
+Vermont	96,361	100.00	--	--	96,361	5,382	5.29	101,743
Virginia	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Washington	1,415,511	94.69	79,221	5.31	1,494,732	64,262	4.14	1,558,994
+West Virginia	718,861	100.00	--	--	718,861	14,671	2.01	733,532
Wisconsin	1,800,358	82.95	369,868	17.05	2,170,226	12,509	0.58	2,182,735
Wyoming	21,919	95.76	969	4.24	22,888	197	0.87	23,085
+American Samoa	30,000	100.00	--	--	30,000	0	0.00	30,000
+Guam	81,342	100.00	--	--	81,343	0	0.00	81,342
Puerto Rico	1,757,353	92.99	132,274	7.01	1,889,627	58,440	3.00	1,948,067
*Trust Territories of Pacific Islands	62,372	81.99	13,692	18.01	76,064	5,000	6.17	81,064
*Virgin Islands	26,698	68.99	11,995	31.01	38,693	0	0.00	38,693
Bureau of Indian Affairs	130,311	100.00	--	--	130,311	5,000	3.70	135,311

+Includes expenditures for private schools

*Estimated

Table 9. Costs of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers under ESEA title II: Fiscal Year 1973

State or Other Area	School Library Resources		Textbooks		Other Instructional Materials		Total
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$55,888,589	89.18	$1,271,207	2.05	$5,501,298	8.77	$62,661,094
Alabama	1,035,342	88.63	2,819	0.24	129,943	11.13	1,168,104
Alaska	107,906	95.34	5,264	4.66	-0-	0.0	113,170
Arizona	498,883	97.50	-0-	0.0	12,804	2.50	511,687
Arkansas	571,896	88.44	-0-	0.0	74,681	11.56	646,577
California	6,292,441	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	6,292,441
Colorado	685,756	77.32	-0-	0.0	201,083	22.68	886,839
*Connecticut	1,336,619	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,336,619
Delaware	195,186	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	195,186
*District of Columbia	241,968	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	241,968
Florida	88,764	98.92	-0-	0.0	968	1.08	89,732
Georgia	1,681,174	97.39	31,074	1.79	14,100	0.82	1,726,348
Hawaii	181,609	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	181,609
*Idaho	222,392	74.99	-0-	0.0	74,131	25.01	296,523
Illinois	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Indiana	2,313,696	98.03	-0-	0.0	46,276	1.97	2,359,972
Iowa	1,136,343	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,136,343
Kansas	987,762	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	987,762
Kentucky	1,155,442	92.90	62,749	5.04	25,560	2.06	1,243,751
*Louisiana	1,492,142	98.87	17,000	1.13	-0-	0.0	1,509,142
*Maine	379,553	94.56	21,794	5.44	-0-	0.0	401,347
*Maryland	1,408,252	79.00	17,826	1.01	356,519	19.99	1,782,597
Massachusetts	2,430,428	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	2,430,428
Michigan	272,306	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	272,306
Minnesota	1,626,648	98.66	-0-	0.0	22,097	1.34	1,648,745
Mississippi	4,660	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	4,660
Missouri	2,098,188	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	2,098,188
Montana	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Nebraska	236,072	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	236,072
Nevada	72,656	37.11	-0-	0.0	123,138	62.89	195,794
New Hampshire	237,208	95.09	1,340	0.54	10,907	4.37	249,455
New Jersey	732,920	35.64	-0-	0.0	1,323,444	64.36	2,056,364
*New Mexico	317,433	68.00	84,026	18.00	65,354	14.00	466,813
New York	5,739,701	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	5,739,701
North Carolina	1,880,988	99.91	150	0.01	1,389	0.08	1,882,527
North Dakota	265,340	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	265,340
Ohio	5,005,196	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	5,005,196
Oklahoma	740,567	75.50	-0-	0.0	240,436	24.50	981,003
Oregon	821,390	99.82	-0-	0.0	1,476	0.18	822,866
Pennsylvania	3,056,735	74.22	10,614	0.27	1,050,752	25.51	4,118,101
Rhode Island	176,766	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	176,766
South Carolina	798,874	71.65	-0-	0.0	315,987	28.35	1,114,861
South Dakota	220,559	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	220,559
Tennessee	886,830	64.86	37,105	2.72	443,412	32.42	1,367,347
Texas	970,255	99.66	1,352	0.14	1,892	0.20	973,499
Utah	472,995	99.01	4,685	0.99	-0-	0.0	477,680
Vermont	30,013	31.15	66,348	68.85	-0-	0.0	96,361
Virginia	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Washington	1,309,169	87.58	-0-	0.0	185,563	12.42	1,494,732
West Virginia	718,861	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	718,861
Wisconsin	1,958,222	90.23	31,147	1.44	180,857	8.33	2,170,226
Wyoming	21,906	95.70	-0-	0.0	982	4.30	22,888
American Samoa	30,000	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	30,000
Guam	56,940	69.99	-0-	0.0	24,403	30.01	81,343
Puerto Rico	507,297	26.85	856,137	45.30	526,193	27.85	1,889,627
*Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	35,750	46.99	19,777	26.02	20,537	26.99	76,064
*Virgin Islands	38,693	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	38,693
Bureau of Indian Affairs	103,897	79.73	-0-	0.0	26,414	20.27	130,311

*Estimated

Table 10. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in public elementary and secondary schools under ESEA title II: Fiscal year 1973

State or Outlying Area	School Library Resources		Textbooks		Other Instructional Materials		Total
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$32,800,016	88.06	$1,042,489	2.80	$3,404,487	9.14	$37,246,992
Alabama	1,003,730	88.40	2,819	0.20	129,005	11.40	1,135,554
Alaska	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
+Arizona	--	--	0	0.00	--	--	--
+Arkansas	--	--	0	0.00	--	--	--
California	5,925,734	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5,925,734
Colorado	671,937	77.51	0	0.00	194,888	22.49	866,825
*Connecticut	1,109,394	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1,109,394
Delaware	172,026	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	172,026
*District of Columbia	220,191	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	220,191
Florida	60,332	98.92	0	0.00	658	1.08	60,990
+Georgia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
+Hawaii	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
*Idaho	211,273	75.00	0	0.00	70,424	25.00	281,697
Illinois	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Indiana	2,174,797	98.14	0	0.00	41,032	1.86	2,215,829
+Iowa	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
Kansas	947,705	100.0	0	0.00	0	0.00	947,705
Kentucky	1,071,333	93.31	55,520	4.83	21,304	1.86	1,148,157
*Louisiana	1,212,747	97.99	24,750	2.01	0	0.00	1,237,497
*Maine	344,297	92.99	0	0.00	25,915	7.01	370,212
*Maryland	1,211,096	79.00	15,330	1.01	306,606	19.99	1,533,032
Massachusetts	2,060,474	100.0	0	0.00	0	0.00	2,060,474
Michigan	223,572	100.0	0	0.00	0	0.00	223,572
+Minnesota	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
+Mississippi	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
+Missouri	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
Montana	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Nebraska	189,530	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	189,530
+Nevada	--	--	0	0.00	--	--	--
+New Hampshire	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Jersey	581,001	34.04	0	0.00	1,126,165	65.96	1,707,166
*New Mexico	298,387	68.00	78,984	17.99	61,433	14.01	438,804
New York	5,042,362	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5,042,362
North Carolina	1,850,418	100.00	0	0.00	354		1,850,772
North Dakota	247,844	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	247,844
+Ohio	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Oklahoma	721,650	75.00	0	0.00	240,436	25.00	962,086
Oregon	785,956		0	0.00	0	0.00	785,956
Pennsylvania	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island	149,652	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	149,652
+South Carolina	--	--	0	0.00	--	--	--
+South Dakota	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
Tennessee	824,284	64.41	36,730	2.88	418,706	32.71	1,279,720
+Texas	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
+Utah	--	--	--	--	0	0.00	--
+Vermont	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Washington	1,239,783	87.58	0	0.00	175,728	12.42	1,415,511
+West Virginia	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
Wisconsin	1,664,029	92.43	12,691	0.70	123,638	6.87	1,800,358
Wyoming	21,172	96.60	0	0.00	747	2.40	21,919
+American Samoa	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
+Guam	--	--	0	0.00	0	0.00	--
Puerto Rico	507,297	28.86	799,448	45.49	450,608	25.65	1,757,353
*Trust Territories of Pacific Islands	29,315	47.00	16,217	26.44	16,840	26.56	62,372
*Virgin Islands	26,698	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	26,698
Bureau of Indian Affairs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

+Totals for public and private are reported in table 3.
*Estimated

Table 11. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools under ESEA title II: Fiscal Year 1973

State or Other Area	School Library Resources		Textbooks		Other Instructional Materials		Total
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$1,174,008	29.83	$99,430	2.52	$2,661,296	67.65	$3,934,734
Alabama	31,612	97.11	-0-	0.0	938	2.89	32,550
Alaska	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Arizona	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Arkansas	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
California	366,707	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	366,707
Colorado	13,819	69.04	-0-	0.0	6,195	30.96	20,014
*Connecticut	227,225	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	227,225
Delaware	23,160	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	23,160
*District of Columbia	21,777	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	21,777
Florida	28,432	98.92	-0-	0.0	310	1.08	28,742
Georgia	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Hawaii	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
*Idaho	10,894	73.47	-0-	0.0	3,932	26.53	14,826
Illinois	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Indiana	138,899	96.36	-0-	0.0	5,244	3.64	144,143
Iowa	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Kansas	40,057	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	40,057
Kentucky	84,109	87.98	7,229	7.56	4,256	4.46	95,594
*Louisiana	266,212	97.99	5,433	2.01	-0-	0.0	271,645
*Maine	28,956	93.00	-0-	0.0	2,179	7.0	31,135
*Maryland	197,155	78.99	2,496	2.22	49,914	18.79	249,565
Massachusetts	369,954	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	369,954
Michigan	48,734	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	48,734
Minnesota	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Mississippi	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Missouri	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Montana	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Nebraska	46,542	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	46,542
Nevada	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
New Hampshire	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
New Jersey	151,919	43.50	-0-	0.0	197,279	56.50	349,198
*New Mexico	19,046	67.99	5,042	18.00	3,921	14.01	28,009
New York	697,339	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	697,339
North Carolina	30,570	96.26	150	0.49	1,035	3.25	31,755
North Dakota	17,496	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	17,496
Ohio	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Oklahoma	18,917	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	18,917
Oregon	35,434	96.00	-0-	0.0	1,476	0.40	36,910
Pennsylvania	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Rhode Island	27,114	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	27,114
South Carolina	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
South Dakota	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Tennessee	62,546	71.37	375	0.44	24,706	28.19	87,627
Texas	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Utah	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Vermont	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Virginia	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Washington	69,386	87.58	-0-	0.0	9,835	12.42	79,221
West Virginia	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Wisconsin	294,193	67.37	18,456	7.16	57,219	15.47	369,868
Wyoming	734	75.74	-0-	0.0	235	24.26	969
American Samoa	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Guam	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Puerto Rico	-0-	0.0	56,689	42.86	75,585	57.14	132,274
*Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	6,435	47.06	3,560	26.05	3,677	26.89	13,672
*Virgin Islands	11,995	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	11,995
Bureau of Indian Affairs	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-

*Estimated

Table 12. Expenditures for instructional materials loaned to children and teacher in public and private elementary and secondary schools; cost of ordering cataloging, processing, and delivering materials under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974

	School Library Resources		Textbooks				
State or Other area	**Cost**	**Percent**	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$64,230,367		$ 878,254		$ 4,085,287		$69,193,978
Alabama	1,050,007	93.9	33,650	2.9	36,814	3.2	1,120,471
Alaska	47,536	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	47,536
Arizona	805,090	98.5	-0-	0.0	12,000	1.5	817,092
Arkansas	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
California	1,416,820	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,416,820
Colorado	848,055	85.0	-0-	0.0	149,351	15.0	997,406
Connecticut	993,816	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	993,816
Delaware	195,540	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	195,540
District of Columbia	235,425	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	235,425
Florida	2,365,796	99.6	6,865	0.4	-0-	0.0	2,372,661
Georgia	1,673,634	99.4	-0-	0.0	9,551	0.6	1,683,185
Hawaii	93,440	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	93,440
Idaho	241,635	81.9	-0-	0.0	53,445	18.1	295,080
Illinois	4,850,550	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	4,850,550
Indiana	1,782,433	99.4	-0-	0.0	10,344	0.6	1,792,777
Iowa	1,132,956	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,132,956
Kansas	866,112	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	866,112
Kentucky	1,123,179	90.4	98,814	7.9	19,562	1.5	1,241,555
Louisiana	1,427,499	94.7	-0-	0.0	79,305	5.3	1,506,804
Maine	91,597	95.0	-0-	0.0	21,652	5.0	433,249
Maryland	1,380,767	80.0	-0-	0.0	345,192	20.0	1,725,959
Massachusetts	2,207,240	99.1	19,932	0.9	-0-	0.0	2,227,172
Michigan	1,290,907	84.9	9,148	0.7	218,095	14.4	1,419,150
Minnesota	1,648,597	98.6	-0-	0.0	21,898	1.4	1,670,495
Mississippi	84,620	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	84,620
Missouri	1,838,081	99.4	1,505	0.1	8,400	0.5	1,847,986
Montana	221,721	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	221,721
Nebraska	336,281	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	336,281
Nevada	72,510	35.5	-0-	0.0	132,077	64.5	204,587
New Hampshire	211,778	79.7	771	0.3	52,944	20.0	265,493
New Jersey	2,246,079	76.8	-0-	0.0	678,083	23.2	2,924,162
New Mexico	91,130	67.3	20,926	15.4	23,537	17.3	135,593
New York	6,547,525	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	6,547,525
North Carolina	1,792,129	99.8	180	0.1	2,276	0.1	1,794,585
North Dakota	230,804	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	230,804
Ohio	4,576,791	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	4,576,791
Oklahoma	716,910		-0-	0.0	279,097		996,007
Oregon	797,620	96.9	-0-	0.0	24,675	3.1	822,295
Pennsylvania	3,329,335	74.2	11,560	0.3	1,145,359		4,486,254
Rhode Island	197,494	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	197,494
South Carolina	938,305	94.1	-0-	0.0	58,534	5.9	996,839
South Dakota	267,028	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	267,028
Tennessee	1,277.083	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,277,082
Texas	3,190,268	99.9	928	0.1	-0-	0.0	3,191,196
Utah	469,745	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	469,745
Vermont	84,199	48.9	87,983	51.1	-0-	0.0	172,182
Virginia	1,785,555	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,785,555
Washington	1,285,578	95.0	-0-	0.0	88,558	5.0	1,374,136
West Virginia	658,132	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	648,132
Wisconsin	1,945,906	98.8	24,401	1.2	-0-	0.0	1,970,307
American Samoa	24,500	86.2	-0-	0.0	3,920	13.8	28,420
Guam	74,769	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	74,769
Puerto Rico	561,591	33.3	561,591	33.3	561,591	33.3	1,684,773
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	57,448	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	57,448
Virgin Islands	41,339	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	41,339
Bureau of Indian Affairs	75,594	62.9	-0-	0.0	44,705	37.1	120,299

Table 13. Costs of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974

State or Other Areas	Instructional Materials				Total Instructional Materials			Total Acquisition
	Public		Private					
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent		Cost	Percent	
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
TOTALS	$62,369,588	90.14	$6,824,390	9.86	$69,193,978	$2,005,250	2.82	$71,199,228
Alabama	1,087,907	97.1	32,564	2.9	1,120,471	15,942	1.4	1,136,413
** Alaska	47,536	100.0	-	-	47,536	-0-	0.0	47,536
* Arizona	759,896	93.0	57,196	7.0	817,092	-0-	0.0	817,092
Arkansas	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	-0-	0.0	-0-
California	337,773	94.4	79,047	5.6	1,416,820	161,972	10.2	1,578,792
* Colorado	917,614	92.0	79,792	8.0	997,406	-0-	0.0	997,406
Connecticut	846,385	85.1	147,431	14.9	993,816	-0-	0.0	993,816
Deleware	176,185	90.1	19,355	9.9	195,540	10,653	5.1	206,193
* District of Columbia	211,882	89.9	23,543	10.1	235,425	-0-	0.0	235,425
Florida	2,181,539	91.7	191,122	8.3	2,372,661	182,567	7.1	2,555,228
Georgia	1,632,689	96.9	50,496	3.1	1,683,185	132,648	7.3	1,815,833
Hawaii	80,778	86.4	12,662	13.6	93,440	-0-	0.0	93,440
** Idaho	295,080	100.0	-	-	295,080	-0-	0.0	295,080
Illinois	4,171,473	85.9	679,077	14.1	4,850,550	-0-	0.0	4,850,550
Indiana	1,698,629	94.7	94,148	5.3	1,792,777	81,717	4.3	1,874,494
** Iowa	1,132,956	100.0	-	-	1,132,956	63,998	5.3	1,196,954
Kansas	823,404	95.1	42,708	4.9	866,112	28,671	3.2	894,783
Kentucky	1,144,840	92.2	96,715	7.8	1,241,555	51,999	4.0	1,293,554
** Louisiana	1,506,804	100.0	-	-	1,506,804	-0-	0.0	1,506,804
* Maine	389,924	90.0	43,325	10.0	433,249	-0-	0.0	433,249
* Maryland	1,553,363	90.0	172,596	10.0	1,725,959	-0-	0.0	1,725,959
Massachusetts	1,901,332	85.4	325,840	14.6	2,227,172	87,967	3.7	2,315,139
Michigan	1,336,589	87.9	182,561	12.1	1,519,150	-0-	0.0	1,519,150
Minnesota	1,503,445	89.9	167,050	10.1	1,670,495	68,379	3.9	1,738,874
Mississippi	67,094	79.2	17,526	20.8	84,620	2,843	3.2	87,463
Missouri	1,655,210	89.5	192,776	10.5	1,847,986	72,344	3.7	1,920,330
** Montana	221,721	100.0	-	-	221,721	-0-	0.0	221,721
Nebraska	269,147	80.0	67,134	20.0	336,281	10,300	2.9	346,581
Nevada	195,257	95.4	9,330	4.6	204,587	1,795	0.8	206,382
New Hampshire	237,180	89.3	28,313	10.7	265,493	23,267	8.0	288,760
New Jersey	1,757,160	60.0	1,167,002	40.0	2,924,162	38,044	1.2	2,962,206
New Mexico	114,651	84.5	20,942	15.5	135,593	-0-	0.0	135,593
New York	5,761,842	88.0	785,683	12.0	6,547,525	590,103	8.2	7,137,628
North Carolina	1,761,522	98.1	33,063	1.9	1,794,585	19,264	10.6	1,813,849
* North Dakota	219,264	95.0	11,540	5.0	230,804	-0-	0.0	230,804
Ohio	3,978,044	86.9	598,747	13.1	4,576,791	-0-	0.0	4,576,791
Oklahoma	976,995		19,012		996,007	4,526		1,000,533
Oregon	789,224	95.9	33,071	4.1	822,295	-0-	0.0	822,295
Pennsylvania	3,824,979	85.2	661,275	14.8	4,486,254	138,722	2.9	4,624,976
Rhode Island	191,709	97.0	5,785	3.0	197,494	-0-	0.0	197,494
South Carolina	982,659	98.5	14,180	1.5	996,839	61,368	5.7	1,058,207
** South Dakota	267,028	100.0	-	-	267,028	5,057	1.8	272,085
Tennessee	1,251,575	98.0	25,507	2.0	1,277,082	-0-	0.0	1,277,082
** Texas	3,191,197	100.0	-	-	3,191,196	-0-	0.0	3,191,196
** Utah	469,745	100.0	-	-	469,745	-0-	0.0	469,745
** Vermont	172,182	100.0	-	-	172,182	6,513	2.5	178,695
Virginia	1,724,980	96.6	60,575	3.4	1,785,555	40,084	2.1	1,825,639
Washington	1,333,539		40,597		1,374,136	19,188	1.9	1,393,324
* West Virginia	615,725	94.9	32,407	5.1	648,132	13,205	1.9	661,337
Wisconsin	1,655,058	84.0	315,249	16.0	1,970,307	12,095	0.6	1,982,402
Wyoming	123,887	97.3	3,392	2.7	127,279	-0-	0.0	127,279
American Samoa	24,500	86.2	3,920	13.8	28,420	-0-	0.0	28,420
Trust Territories	74,769	100.0	-	-	74,769	-0-	0.0	74,769
of the Pacific Islands	49,924	86.9	7,524	13.1	57,448	7,913	1.2	65,361
** Guam	74,769	100.0	-	-	74,769	-0-	0.0	74,769
* Puerto Rico	1,516,296	90.0	168,477	10.0	1,684,773	52,106	3.0	1,736,879
Virgin Islands	37,204	90.0	4,135	10.0	41,339	-0-	0.0	41,339
* Bureau of Indian Affairs	120,299	100.0	-	-	120,299	-0-	0.0	120,299

* Estimated
** Includes expenditures for public and private school children

Table 14. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers under ESEA title II programs: Fiscal Years 1966-1974

Fiscal Year	School Library Resources Cost	School Library Resources Percent	Textbooks Cost	Textbooks Percent	Other Instructional Materials Cost	Other Instructional Materials Percent	Total Cost
1966	$ 77,520,136	90.34	$ 2,959,485	3.45	$ 5,327,473	6.21	$ 85,807,094
1967	83,813,850	92.14	3,108,949	3.42	4,030,201	4.44	90,953,000
1968	82,238,230	90.67	2,174,495	4.88	3,538,240	7.95	87,951,965
1969	40,658,520	91.35	1,638,314	3.68	2,212,541	4.97	44,509,375
1970	31,685,677	94.98	244,157	0.73	1,429,828	4.29	33,359,662
1971	59,499,500	91.97	1,076,007	1.67	4,110,341	6.36	64,685,848
1972	69,946,321	93.17	726,135	0.97	4,400,649	5.86	75,073,105
1973	55,888,589	89.19	1,271,207	2.03	5,501,298	8.78	62,661,094
1974	64,230,437	92.07	878,254	1.27	4,085,287	5.90	69,193,978
Total	$565,481,260	92.07	$14,077,003	2.29	$34,636,858	5.64	$614,195,121

Table 15. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional mateirals loaned to children and teachers in public elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974

State or other Areas	School Library Resources		Textbooks		Other Instructional Materials		Total
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
TOTALS	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Totals	$58,503,998	93.80	$797,024	1.28	$3,068,566	4.92	62,369,588
Alabama	1,018,766	93.6	336,650	30.9	35,491	32.6	1,087,907
Alaska **	47,536	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	47,536
Arizona *	744,699	98.0	- 0 -	0.0	15,197	2.0	759,896
Arkansas	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -
California	1,337,773	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,337,773
Colorado *	871,733	95.0	- 0 -	0.0	45,881	5.0	917,614
Connecticut	846,385	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	846,385
Delaware	176,185	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	176,185
District of Columbia*	211,882	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	211,882
Florida	2,174,674	99.6	6,865	0.4	- 0 -	0.0	2,181,539
Georgia	1,623,138	99.4	- 0 -	0.0	19,551	0.6	1,632,689
Hawaii	80,778	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	80,778
Idaho **	241,635	81.9	- 0 -	0.0	53,445	18.1	295,080
Illinois	4,171,473	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	4,171,473
Indiana	1,688,842	99.4	- 0 -	0.0	9,787	0.6	1,698,629
Iowa **	1,132,956	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,132,956
Kansas	823,404	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	823,404
Kentucky	1,038,030	90.6	91,305	7.9	15,505	1.5	1,144,840
Louisiana **	1,427,499	94.7	- 0 -	0.0	79,305	5.3	1,506,804
Maine *	370,438	95.0	- 0 -	0.0	19,486	5.0	389,924
Maryland *	1,398,027	90.0	- 0 -	0.0	155,336	10.0	1,553,363
Massachusetts *	1,881,400	98.9	19,932	1.1	- 0 -	0.0	1,901,332
Michigan	1,173,615	87.8	- 0 -	0.0	162,974	12.2	1,336,589
Minnesota	1,481,547	98.5	- 0 -	0.0	21,898	1.5	1,503,445
Mississippi	67,094	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	67,094
Missouri	1,645,305	99.4	1,505	0.1	8,400	0.5	1,655,210
Montana **	221,721	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	221,721
Nebraska	269,147	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	269,147
Nevada	67,985	34.8	- 0 -	0.0	127,272	65.2	195,257
New Hampshire	324,589	94.7	771	0.3	11,820	5.0	237,180
New Jersey	1,436,466	81.7	- 0 -	0.0	320,694	18.3	1,757,160
New Mexico	74,297	64.9	20,910	18.2	19,344	16.9	114,651
New York	5,761,842	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	5,761,842
North Carolina	1,761,522	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,761,522
North Dakota *	219,264	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	219,264
Ohio	3,978,044	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	3,978,044
Oklahoma	697,898		- 0 -	0.0	279,097	28.6	976,995
Oregon	765,716	97.0	- 0 -	0.0	23,508	3.0	789,224
Pennsylvania	2,839,392		11,560	0.3	974,027		3,824,979
Rhode Island	191,709	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	191,709
South Carolina	925,192	94.2	- 0 -	0.0	57,467	5.8	982,659
South Dakota **	267,028	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	267,028
Tennessee	1,251,575	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,251,575
Texas **	3,190,268	99.9	928	0.1	- 0 -	0.0	3,191,196
Utah **	469,745	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	469,745
Vermont **	84,199	48.9	87,983	51.0	- 0 -	0.0	172,182
Virginia	1,724,980	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,724,980
Washington	1,267,907	95.0	- 0 -	0.0	65,632	5.0	1,333,539
West Virginia *	615,725	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	615,725
Wisconsin	1,638,875	99.0	16,183	1.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,655,058
Wyoming	120,495	97.2	- 0 -	0.0	3,392	2.8	123,887
Bur. of Indians Affairs	75,594	62.9	- 0 -	0.0	44,705	37.1	120,299
American Samoa	20,580	84.0	- 0 -	0.0	3,920	16.0	24,500
Guam **	74,769	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	74,769
Puerto Rico *	505,432	33.3	505,432	33.3	505,432	33.3	1,516,296
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	49,924	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	49,924
Virgin Islands *	37,204	100.0	- 0 -	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	37,204

* Estimated ** Includes expenditures for public and private school children

Table 16. Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials loaned to children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools under ESEA Title II: Fiscal Year 1974

State and other area	School Library Resources		Textbook		Other Instructional Materials		Total
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$ 6,053,230	88.70	$ 79,524	1.17	$ 691,636	10.13	$ 6,824,390
Alabama	31,241	95.9	-0-	0.0	1,323	4.1	32,564
Alaska	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
* Arizona	53,764	94.0	-0-	0.0	3,432	6.0	57,196
Arkansas	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
California	79,047	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	79,047
* Colorado	75,802	95.0	-0-	0.0	3,990	5.0	79,792
Connecticut	147,431	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	147,431
Deleware	19,355	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	19,355
* District of Columbia	23,543	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	23,543
Florida	191,122	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	191,122
Georgia	50,496	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	50,496
Hawaii	12,662	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	12,662
Idaho	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
Illinois	679,077	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	697,077
Indiana	93,591	99.4	-0-	0.0	557	0.6	94,148
Iowa	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
Kansas	42,708	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	42,708
Kentucky	86,076	89.0	5,803	6.0	4,836	5.0	96,715
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
* Maine	41,159	95.0	-0-	0.0	2,166	5.0	43,325
* Maryland	155,336	90.0	-0-	0.0	17,260	10.0	172,596
Massachusetts	325,840	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	325,840
Michigan	117,292	64.2	9,148	5.1	56,121	30.7	182,561
Minnesota	167,050	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	167,050
Mississippi	17,526	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	17,526
Missouri	192,776	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	192,776
Montana	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
Nebraska	67,134	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	67,134
Nevada	4,525	48.5	-0-	0.0	4,805	51.5	9,330
New Hampshire	27,098	95.7	-0-	0.0	1,215	4.3	28,313
New Jersey	809,613	69.4	-0-	0.0	357,389	30.6	1,167,002
New Mexico	16,733	79.9	16	0.1	4,193	20.0	20,942
New York	785,683	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	785,633
North Carolina	30,607	92.5	180	0.7	2,276	6.8	33,063
North Dakota	11,540	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	11,540
Ohio	598,747	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	598,747
Oklahoma	19,012	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	19,012
Oregon	31,904	96.5	-0-	0.0	1,167	3.5	33,071
Pennsylvania	490,843	74.2	-0-	0.0	170,432	25.8	661,275
Rhode Island	5,785	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	5,785
South Carolina	13,113	92.4	-0-	0.0	1,067	7.6	14,180
South Dakota	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
Tennessee	25,507	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	25,507
Texas	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
Utah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	60,575	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	60,575
Washington	37,349	92.0	-0-	0.0	3,248	8.0	40,597
* West Virginia	32,407	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	32,407
Wisconsin	307,031	97.4	8,218	2.6	-0-	0.0	315,249
Wyoming	3,392	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	3,392
American Samoa	3,920	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	3,920
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	7,524	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	7,524
Guam	-	-	-0-	0.0	-	-	-
* Puerto Rico	56,159	33.3	56,159	33.3	56,159	33.3	168,477
* Virgin Islands	4,135	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	4,135
Bureau of Indian Affairs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Estimated

Table 17. Number of public elementary and secondary schools with and without school library/media centers: Fiscal Year 1974

State or Other Area	Number of Schools Total*	Number of Schools Elementary	Number of Schools Secondary	Elementary Schools with Libraries Number	Elementary Schools with Libraries Percent	Elementary Schools without Libraries Number	Elementary Schools without Libraries Percent	Secondary Schools with Libraries Number	Secondary Schools with Libraries Percent	Secondary Schools without Libraries Number	Secondary Schools without Libraries Percent	Total Schools with Libraries Number	Total Schools with Libraries Percent	Total Schools without Libraries Number	Total Schools without Libraries Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
	62,827	43,321	18,284	34,152	78.83	9,169	21.17	17,076	93.40	1,208	6.60	52,345	83.31	10,482	16.69
Alabama	1,381	1,027	354	943	91.8	84	8.2	349	98.6	5	1.4	1,292	93.6	89	6.4
Alaska	340	269	71	92	34.2	177	65.8	60	84.5	11	15.5	152	44.7	188	55.3
Arizona	795	674	121	580	86.0	[illegible]	14.0	120	99.1	1	0.9	700	88.0	95	12.0
Arkansas	1,192	674	518	423	62.8	251	37.2	389	75.0	129	25.0	812	68.1	380	31.9
California	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Colorado	1,222	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1,127	92.2	95	7.8
Connecticut	1,174	898	276	870	96.8	28	[illegible]	274	99.2	2	0.8	1,144	97.4	30	2.6
Delaware	193	143	50	143	100.0	0	0.0	50	100.0	0	0.0	193	100.0	0	0.0
District of Columbia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Florida	1,912	1,242	670	1,242	100.0	0	0.0	670	100.0	0	0.0	1,912	100.0	0	0.0
Georgia	1,799	1,121	678	1,116	99.5	5	0.5	678	100.0	0	0.0	1,794	99.7	5	0.3
Hawaii	242	164	78	164	100.0	0	0.0	78	100,00	0	0.0	242	100.0	0	0.0
Idaho	554	370	184	268	72.4	102	27.6	183	99.4	1	0.6	451	81.4	103	18.6
Illinois	5,184	4,376	808	3,668	83.8	708	16.2	768	95.0	40	0.5	4,436	85.6	748	14.4
Indiana	2,428	1,488	940	1,264	85.0	224	15.0	940	100.0	0	0.0	2,204	90.8	224	9.2
Iowa	1,887	1,191	696	970	81.4	221	18.6	556	80.0	140	20.0	1,526	80.9	361	19.1
Kansas	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Kentucky	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Louisiana	1,418	946	472	843	89.1	103	10.9	432	91.5	40	8.5	1,275	89.9	143	10.1
Maine	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Maryland	1,334	934	400	916	98.0	18	2.0	382	95.5	18	4.5	1,298	97.3	36	2.7
**Massachusetts	1,729	1,231	498	1,022	83.0	209	17.0	491	98.5	7	1.4	1,513	87.5	216	12.5
Michigan	3,457	2,359	1,098	2,300	97.4	59	2.6	1,025	93.3	73	6.7	3,325	96.1	132	3.9
Minnesota	1,829	1,194	635	1,084	90.8	110	9.2	635	100.0	0	0.0	1,719	94.0	110	6.0
Mississippi	1,083	654	429	578	88.4	76	11.6	429	100.0	0	0.0	1,007	93.0	76	7.0
Missouri	2,259	1,544	715	792	51.2	752	48.8	715	100.0	0	0.0	1,507	66.7	752	33.3
Montana	813	641	172	247	38.5	394	61.5	129	75.0	43	25.0	376	46.2	437	53.8
Nebraska	1,682	1,377	305	836	61.0	541	39.0	305	100.0	0	0.0	1,141	67.8	541	32.2
Nevada	285	180	105	69	38.3	111	61.7	61	58.1	44	41.9	130	45.6	155	54.4
New Hampshire	487	368	119	150	41.0	218	59.0	95	80.0	24	20.0	245	50.3	242	49.7
New Jersey	2,319	1,926	393	1,312	68.1	614	31.9	393	100.0	0	0.0	1,705	73.5	614	26.5
New Mexico	612	404	208	320	79.2	84	20.8	208	100.0	0	0.0	528	86.3	84	13.7
New York	4,436	2,863	1,573	2,846	99.4	17	0.6	1,573	100.0	0	0.0	4,419	99.6	17	0.4
North Carolina	2,008	1,443	565	1,443	100.0	0	0.0	565	100.0	0	0.0	2,008	100.0	0	0.0
North Dakota	754	496	258	252	50.1	244	49.9	258	100.0	0	0.0	510	67.6	244	32.4
Ohio	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Oklahoma	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Oregon	1,278	946	332	902	95.3	44	4.7	320	96.4	12	3.6	1,222	95.6	56	4.4
Pennsylvania	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island	378	314	64	306	97.4	8	2.6	64	100.0	0	0.0	370	97.9	8	2.1
South Carolina	1,105	811	294	811	100.0	0	0.0	294	100.0	0	0.0	1,105	100.0	0	0.0
South Dakota	902	698	204	30	4.2	668	95.8	203	99.5	1	0.5	233	25.9	669	74.1
Tennessee	1,701	1,239	462	1,039	83.9	200	16.1	462	100.0	0	0.0	1,501	88.2	200	11.8
Texas	5,303	3,254	2,049	1,494	45.9	1,760	54.1	1,432	69.9	617	30.1	2,926	55.2	2,377	44.8
Utah	559	375	184	375	100.0	0	0.0	184	100.0	0	0.0	559	100.0	0	0.0
Vermont	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia	1,780	1,231	549	1,220	99.1	11	0.9	549	100.0	0	0.0	1,769	99.4	11	0.6
Washington	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
West Virginia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wisconsin	2,315	1,696	619	1,102	64.9	594	35.1	619	100.0	0	0.0	1,721	74.3	594	25.7
Wyoming	192	132	60	36	27.3	96	72.7	60	100.0	0	0.0	96	50.0	96	50.0
American Samoa	31	27	4	4	3.8	23	85.2	4	100.0	0	0.0	8	25.8	23	74.2
Guam	35	26	9	26	100.0	0	0.0	9	100.0	0	0.0	35	100.0	0	0.0
Puerto Rico	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	240	224	16	17	7.6	207	92.4	16	100.0	0	0.0	33	13.7	207	86.3
Virgin Islands															
Bureau of Indian Affairs	200	151	49	37	24.5	114	75.5	49	100.0	0	0.0	76	38.0	124	62.0

*Detail does not add to total in Col. 2 since Colorado reported only totals.

**Estimated

II. NDEA Title III: STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN THE ACADEMIC SUBJECTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Fiscal years 1973 and 1974 were the fifteenth and sixteenth years in which the program under title III of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) as amended, supported the strengthening of instruction in local educational agencies through the acquisition of instructional materials and equipment and carrying out minor remodeling of classrooms, laboratories, and audio-visual libraries, and through supervisory and related services provided by State educational agencies. The program has experienced considerable growth, the number of eligible academic elementary and secondary school subjects increasing from three to 12. These subjects are: the arts, civics, economics, English, geography, history, the humanities, industrial arts, mathematics, modern foreign languages, reading, and science.

The allotments to States under NDEA title III for fiscal years 1959-1974 are tabulated on the following page. NDEA title III is a matching program. The Federal share is up to one-half of the expenditures for acquisition of equipment, materials, and minor remodeling, and for administration of the State plan. Funds for the loan program for nonprofit private schools are also shown. The loan program provides funds at a reduced rate of interest to private schools for the same purposes as the acquisitions program for public schools - strengthening instruction; through equipment, materials, and minor remodeling. For fiscal year 1974, the interest rate was 7 1/8 percent.

Allotments for equipment, materials, minor remodeling;
administration of the State plan; and loan programs
under NDEA title III: fiscal years 1959-74

Fiscal year	Authorization	Equipment materials, minor remodeling	Administration of the State plan	Loan program
1959	$ 70,000,000	$ 49,280,000	$ 1,350,000	$ 6,720,000
1960	70,000,000	52,800,000	4,000,000	7,200,000
1961	70,000,000	47,520,000	3,750,000	6,480,000
1962	70,000,000	47,520,000	3,750,000	6,480,000
1963	70,000,000	47,520,000	3,750,000	6,480,000
1964	70,000,000	42,512,952	3,365,070	6,480,000
1965	90,000,000	69,992,500	4,619,215	9,600,000
1966	100,000,000	78,637,010	6,831,163	10,800,000 1/
1967	100,000,000	79,200,000	8,980,000	10,800,000
1968	110,000,000	75,240,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
1969	110,000,000	74,240,000	2,000,000	1,000,000 2/

1/ Until fiscal year 1968, State supervisory and related services were supported in addition to administration.

2/ Beginning in 1969, the loan program funds were no longer allotted by States, but administered as a total amount for the United States.

Fiscal year	Authorization	Equipment materials, minor remodeling	Administration of the State plan	Loan program
1970	$120,500,000	$ 34,679,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 500,000
1971	130,500,000	47,500,000	2,000,000	500,000
1972	130,500,000	47,750,000	2,000,000	250,000
1973	130,500,000	47,750,000 3/	2,000,000	250,000 3/
1974	130,500,000	26,750,000	2,000,000	25,000
Total	$1,572,500,000	$869,391,462	$54,395,448	$74,790,000

Section 303(a)(2) of NBEA title III and the title III regualtions require the State plan to develop principles for determining the priority of projects to be approved in the order determined by the application of such principles, which should reflect the State's consideration of:

The State's educational goals

The total general educational need in the academic subjects under title III

Special instructional needs which title III may serve in a State

The special requirements for equipment and facilities in each of the subject fields and the grade levels to be served

The categories of eligible equipment, materials, and type of minor remodeling allowable and the State standards developed to enhance instructional programs.

These priorities form the general bases for the NDEA title III acquisition program.

The combined report for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 is derived from the narrative reports submitted by each State educational agency to the U. S. Office of Education. Examples from States of program activities are arranged in the order of five geographic regions of the United States - Northeast, Southeast, Upper Midwest, Midcontinent, Western.

3/ Funds appropriated for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling for fiscal year 1973 were made available in fiscal year 1974. No expenditures were made from 1973 funds reserved for loans because funds for fiscal year 1974 reserved for loans were first drawn upon.

2. STATE ADMINISTRATION OF NDEA TITLE III

Administrative funds for the NDEA title III program are used for administration of the State plan and to pay the costs of supervisory and related services provided by the State educational agency in the academic subjects. Administrative funds were used for such items as salaries of professional and clerical staff assigned to the program, for workshops and conferences dealing with instruction in the academic subjects, staff travel for consultive visits and professional conferences, office equipment, other equipment used for State programs of supervision, and printing of curriculum guides, application forms, and other items needed for program administration.

Administration - Fiscal Year 1973

The Federal allotment for administration of the NDEA title III program amounted in fiscal year 1973 to $2 million. Of this amount, $1.5 million (79.4 percent of the allotment) was expended by State educational agencies for administration and supervisory and related services, with $416,892 carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1974 (table 1). Federal expenditures were more than matched by State educational agency expenditures of $2.1 million, providing a total of $3.6 million for program administration.

Administration - Fiscal Year 1974

Comparable figures for State administration of NDEA title III in fiscal year 1974 are shown in table 2. The proportion of the Federal allotment expended (66.6 percent) and the matching amount contributed by State educational agencies ($1.7 million) are less than for fiscal year 1974, with a somewhat larger amount of the Federal allotment ($668,010) carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1975. State educational agencies continued to more than match Federal expenditures.

NDEA Title III Personnel in State Educational Agencies

Tables 3 and 4 indicate the number of positions in full-time equivalents assigned to the administration of NDEA title III in State educational agencies in fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The figures for the number of administrators, supervisors, clerical staff, "other" type of personnel, are roughly the same for each year. It should be noted that although acquisition funds for fiscal year 1973 were not allotted until about the middle of fiscal year 1974, administrative funds were allotted to State educational agencies at the beginning of each fiscal year so that program personnel could be retained to carry on such program activities monitoring, reporting, and allotting "carry over" funds from the previous year.

Staff losses for supervisory personnel assigned to NDEA title III administration are considerable when current reports are compared with those in the earlier years of the program; however, it has been previously noted that since fiscal year 1968, funds for supervision of instruction in the academic subjects and related services are paid from funds from ESEA title V.

Expenditures for Materials and Equipment

The use of equipment and materials to improve instruction in the academic subjects means the use of such items in the development, presentation, and learning of the subject matter or content of the course of study in one or more of the academic subjects. Equipment purchased includes audiovisual equipment such as film and video production equipment and laboratory and other equipment used for instruction in the natural sciences, reading, mathematics, the arts, and other subjects. Trends in choices of equipment and materials reflect more individualized and small group experimentation in keeping with the newer directions of reading, science, and mathematics programs and instruction in the arts. Media production operations in all of the academic subjects are expanding and include graphics, printing photography, television and radio, and audiotape production services.

The Federal allotment for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling in fiscal years 1973,and 1974 were $47,750,000 and $26,250,000, respectively. A total of $30.7 million (64.4 percent) of the allotment was expended in fiscal year 1973, with $16.9 million carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1974 (table 5).

In fiscal year 1974, 57 percent of the Federal allotment ($14.9 million) was expended, with $11.2 million carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1975 (table 6). State and local funds more than matched Federal expenditures for both fiscal years.

As in fiscal year 1972, a higher proportion of NDEA title III funds was expended in both fiscal years 1973 and 1974 to purchase equipment and materials for strengthening instruction in English and reading, with expenditures for strengthening instruction in the natural sciences ranking second. Expenditures in these fields are well above the other subject areas (tables 7 and 8). There is only a slight shift in the ranking for the other subject fields compared with previous years. Expenditures for equipment and materials for audio-visual libraries and for minor remodeling to make effective use of equipment purchased continued to be very low priorities.

3. NDEA TITLE III MANAGEMENT GOALS

Management goals identified in the States for the administration of NDEA title III included staff assignments; program information dissemination; determination of allocations; and project development, review, monitoring, and reporting. The one common management goal was the provision of a program that would be supportive of the academic goals of each State, as setforth in a State plan.

A number of States reported that achievement of management goals was somewhat thwarted by the fact that program funds for both fiscal years 1973 and 1974 were released in fiscal year 1974. This necessitated a revision of schedules for receiving, reviewing and approving projects, and a revamping of plans for monitoring activities. Additional staff has to be assigned to assist with the project review process. Although some States has solicited and reviewed applications prior to release of funds, many had not, and consequently has to face under pressure the tasks of developing planning guides, forms, and other materials concerning the submission of projects for dissemination to the schools in their States.

The difficulties of finding matching funds so late in the school year presented another problem to some local school districts, until 45 CFR 141.11 (a) one year, fiscal year 1973, so that Federal funds could be used for matching expenditures incurred by local education agencies for projects not having prior State approval. The fact that P.L. 93-269 provided for obligation and expenditure of funds for fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 through June 30, 1975, also helped States to use NDEA title III funds wisely.

New Jersey's experience illustrates how this modification in regulations made it possible for a State to develop and meet management goals in fiscal year 1974:

> When funds became available in January 1974, for fiscal year 1973 as well as for fiscal year 1974 it was decided that it would be impossible for local education agencies to accomplish the proposal and application process before the end of the school year. Proper planning, purchasing, and implementation of projects, as well as the availability of matching funds, militated against the prospect of almost immediate project implementation. Hence, funds for the two years were carried over for projects planned in the spring of 1974, and implemented in the fall. The one exception were the projects of the twenty country audiovisual libraries which were activated as soon as possible

Perhaps spurred on by this simultaneous releasing of funds for the two fiscal years, other northeastern States stressed urgency in management goals listed. Among these was Connecticut, which has a goal "to minimize delays in the overall process, from initial receipt of application to eventual reimbursement". Connecticut proposed (1) to offer personnel assistance to those school districts not previously participating in the program, and (2) to coordinate the expertise of department specialsist in reviewing project applications.

While all the foregoing management goals were formulated to insure efficiency in program administration, as in the lessening of paperwork, the speeding-up of project application and review, the continuing education process of personnel in local educational agencies, the minimizing of delays in the overall process, and the like, the desire to improve the actual quality of NDEA title III projects was reflected in goals dealing with subject matter areas and the provision of educational leadership. Connecticut, for instance, cited as an important goal, "to render priority to those instructional items within the eligible subject-matter areas that relate to overall departmental goals, e.g., reading, career education, infividualization, awareness of ethnic diversities."

The management-by-objectives system continued to make its impact felt as States structured their programs in terms of measurable objectives, thereby strengthening the program evaluation process. Massachusetts for example, requested applications which included a narrative description of the specific plan for improving instruction, including behavioral objectives; proposed new courses, changes in course content, or method of instruction; and type of materials and equipment to be used.

In the southeast, Alabama, where all school systems participate in NDEA title III, saw a need for a "constant cycling" of all administrative responsibilities, including project planning , review, approval, monitoring and reimbursement. Their specific management goals are based on an awareness that the turnover among local education agency personnel proceeds at a normal rate, and thus the orientation and training process must be continuous:

. To maintain broad support of local education agency efforts to utilize 100% of available funds. No State level funds are provided for the acquisition program, therefore all matching funds are derived from local sources.

. To increase the direct assistance to local education agencies in relation to project planning. This increased effort was accomplished by on-site visits, telephone communications, and in workshops dealing with the administration of Federal programs and the improvement of instruction. A special effort was made to give services to school systems that did not directly seek assistance.

Alabama also reported two management goals that reflected an increased awareness of the need for timeliness:

. To maintain and increase efficiency in the processing of project proposals. As a rule, no project remains in the State office longer than fifteen working days. Projects submitted in recent years reflect improved quality both in the physical makeup of the project and in design for curriculum improvement. If a project does not show with precision the exact nature and use of the materials and equipment requested, the local education agency is contacted for clarification and necessary revision.

- To expedite the reimbursement process. Since the program provides no funds for local administration, every effort is made to maintain an excellent working relationship with school office personnel to enhance the operation of the program. The overall reimbursement process is emphasized each year at the State-wide school office personnel workshop for NDEA title III. Local education agencies are constantly alerted to deadlines that would prevent their reimbursement claims from being honored.

Closely related to the effort to be expeditious in implementing NDEA title III was an awareness expressed by several States in goals striving for efficiency in management. Florida has as one goal the complete revision of the forms to be used by county administrative units in applying for NDEA title III funds; Mississippi planned to initiate new procedures of reporting to local superintendents and junior college presidents any new policies or priorities developed throughout the year so that they might take full advantage of funds alloted to the State; Virginia proposed to publish and disseminate updated guidelines to include a description of the revised allocation formula which provides for variable matching.

Among States in the upper midwest, Missouri and Ohio limited their management goals to those absolutely necessary to the operation of the acquisition program, providing as much help as possible to the participants in planning worthwhile projects. While Wisconsin stated:

> The primary management goal for implementing NDEA III-A... during the school year 1973-74 was to plan for the proper utilization of funds which had been impounded. ...two meetings were held with the State Advisory Council to determine how the SEA could assume stewardship responsibilities

In recognition of the importance of providing a quality program, Wisconsin listed as its second management goal: "to maintain a staff of consultants associated with the critical subject areas of NDEA title III", and Nebraska aimed: "to provide a level of educational leadership from which influence in the form of project selection and financial allocation could be directed towards improving instruction at the local level".

Reports from States in the midcontinent region follow a similar pattern. In New Mexico, there was also concern evidenced in its management goals of the need to apprise local educational agencies of program funds available, to plan with these agencies for wise use of these funds, and to assist local educational agencies in needs assessment, in the evaluation of materials, and in the processing and evaluation of applications. Two of Utah's goals expressed the same needs:

- To maintain a flow of communication from the State agency to local agencies concerning all facets of the program

- To assist local agencies in activities related to assessment of need, determination of priorities, and preparation of project applications.

Two additional management goals for Utah summed up the importance of this kind of objective system:

- To promote a systems approach to planning and to implementing the overall objectives of the program
- To promote the concept of an integrated media sub-system to serve the educational needs of the schools.

The importance of subject area consultants in achieving this goal of quality programs is summed up in a portion of Wyoming's report:

> Consultants in mathematics, science, foreign/bilingual languages, health and drug education, language arts and humanities, industrial education, reading, early chidlhood education, social studies, career guidance, special education, business and distributive education, home economics, agriculture/agribusiness, and adult and continuing education are assigned evaluation and quality control functions in planning and operational phase of all projects. The subject consultants serve as a screening board for project review. Their appraisal becomes an important part of the final selection process. They also act as program disseminators under the direction of the State Department of Education Program Director.

States in the far west expressed this same concern for the need to promote understanding of the program among those at the local level, as in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands where high priority was given management goals to assure (1) Territory-wide awareness of NDEA title III availability and regulations, (2) Local agency understanding of project applications and procedures, and (3) District Directors' involvement in determining priority areas. A direct quote from their report:

> "The Department of Education is constantly striving to widen decentralization of responsibilities; only if the local agencies are well informed can they assume this essential responsibility. At the same time, although there is much need for individualization, there is also the need for Territory-wide curriculum building. Input from all agencies is sought.

And in Arizona, goals for fiscal year 1974 were organized and a calendar was established for deadlines for each activity. Included were preparation, mailing, return, review, approval, and notification of approval of project applications, review of completed projects for eligibility for reimbursement, and forwarding to the Division of Business and Finance for reimbursement.

4. MANAGEMENT GOALS AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

It is a truism worth repeating that NDEA title III can become a viable program only if its management goals fit in with some form of comprehensive planning on the part of State educational agencies - the program was not designed to stand alone. Most States recognized this fact and by fiscal year 1974 many were deeply involved in overall planning, fitting NDEA title III management goals into a comprehensive plan for improving instruction and educational management. In those States where such planning has been successful, it has been accomplished by cooperation of outside consultants and State personnel in management seminars and training programs. Results of this kind of planning coordination include assessment of needs for equipment and materials in the academic subject areas as part of a comprehensive needs assessment, revision of standards, staff development activities, evaluation of instructional programs and expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in the fields of academic subjects.

Comprehensive planning has frequently resulted in reorganization of a State education agency, as happened in Maine. That State revised its entire NDEA title III plan, updating it to incorporate new organizational changes and reassignments in its State Department of Educational and Cultural Services. For better or worse, its reorganized Division of Instruction which has responsibility for NDEA title III is now composed of generalists, rather than specialists, whose jobs have been abolished.

Many State educational agencies saw the provision of better consultative services to local educational agencies as one of their functions in the area of comprehensive planning. One such was Massachusetts which established regional offices. The NDEA title III program has cooperated in this effort, with some project review and monitoring activities conducted by the regional office staff. All six of the regional offices have assisted in dissemination of program information.

New Jersey was another northeastern State providing an example of Federal program coordination with State management goals, in this case through the support of county audiovisual libraries. Although these film libraries are used by 89 percent of the public school population, State financial support is minimal, except for the matching funds needed for NDEA title III participation. Local, county, and State funds are used for the basic operational funds. The NDEA title III funds enable the libraries to acquire the films which are the purpose for the existence of this service.

The Connecticut State Department of Education emphasized the following goals: (a) improving opportunities for all youth to receive quality education; (b) strengthening communication skills; and (c) developing better awareness of self and society. Funding of project applications under NDEA title III is coordinated with these goals. Special emphasis is also given to expand and strengthen instructional resources in rural districts, encourage experimentation, and assist in individualizing instruction.

A concerted trend towards structural planning at the top level, into which NDEA management goals meshed very well, was reported by most of the States in the Southeastern block. Excerpts from some of these reports follow:

- In the Georgia Department of Education, basic planning for programs begins within the unit or division responsible for the activity. The proposed program is presented to the planning council. At the planning council level, all program activities become interwoven into the total comprehensive program of the SEA.

- The North Carolina Department of Education has adopted and implemented a commitment and priority to the implementation of comprehensive planning at all levels of educational analysis and program development. The goals of the NDEA title III program are supportive of and consistent with the goals of the Division of Federal Programs and its role in the State agency.

- In South Carolina, the identification of eleven major objectives serves as a significant unifying force for consolidating professional efforts throughout the Department of Education. All Federally funded programs are brought in line with the five year plan for improvement of education in the State by the naming of certain specific objectives taken from the eleven major objectives list as priorities for the NDEA title III program.

- Tennessee has estabished a Division of School System Management and Planning that provides overall coordination of management activities in the State education agency. This coordinating activity is carried down to the local education agency through the regional centers which are arms of the State education agency.

West Virginia has a comprehensive Educational Program which is somewhat similar to that of Tennessee. One of its objectives is to encourage and support local education agencies as they upgrade their educational programs. General guidelines, procedures and other information provided by the State education agency assist local education agencies with assessment and improvement efforts. Plans containing an assessment of existing efforts and proposals for strengthening and improving local programs are submitted annually by the locals for review and approval by the State education agency. Approved plans relating to NDEA title III subject areas and priorities are the planning bases for using funds for acquisition of equipment and materials and for minor remodeling.

The Florida State Department of Education was reorganized, place like programs and activities together along functional lines. This reorganization moved the NDEA title III program from the Bureau of Evaluation and Compensatory Education to the Library Centers and Resources Section of the Bureau of Curriculum and Personnel Development.

In a number of Upper Midwest States, the continuing concern for the quality of public education prompted State boards of education to adopt and publish statements of common goals, such as The Common Goals of Michigan and the Educational Goals Statements of Nebraskans. These goals serve as statements of broad direction and general purpose, with most States requiring that all programs be developed using such broad goals as frames of reference.

The extent to which the NDEA title III management goals fitted into comprehensive State education agency planning ran the gamut from very much to none. In Illinois management and program goals of the NDEA title III program had to dovetail with those of the State agency. On the other hand, the management goals of the Ohio NDEA title III program were not a part of comprehensive State education agency planning. This was due to the unexpected nature of the availability of funds.

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, a composite of the individual programs it administers, planned accordingly. Such planning included the provision for NDEA title III of some of the services of appropriate personnel within the Department and such support services as data processing. In Wisconsin the NDEA title III management goals of maintaining a corps of subject specialists and planning for the utilization of funds related directly to State education agency planning for direct support to local educational agencies, involvement in teacher education programs, and development and dissemination of curriculum strategies and activities.

Kansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, and other States in the Upper Midwest indicated that their management goals were closely aligned with those of the Divisions of Instruction because those divisions had the responsibility for administering NDEA title III and supervising the close coordination and cooperation of various units of State education agencies.

Several State educational agencies in the Mid-Continent region conducted needs assessments as part of their continuing role in assisting local education agencies. In Wyoming, assigned consultants aid in this process by assisting in the writing of objectives, and development of programs, and the monitoring of projects. Their familiarity with local needs plays an important part in decision making. Montana's needs assessment led its planning unit in the direction of establishing as a priority the improvement of educational opportunities for children in small rural schools. Because of the limitation of NDEA title III funds a matching rate was set at forty percent. In addition, projects for each school district were limited to a reimbursement of $1,000, with a total project of $2,500. As a result, many more rural schools have participated in the program.

5. PROGRAM GOALS AND PRIORITIES

Program goals and priorities in the NDEA title III program must obviously take into account the basic purpose for which the Act is intended, namely, to support the improvement of instruction through the purchase of equipment and materials and minor remodeling and for administration and State policies provided by State departments of education. Most States saw thier goals as:

- Developing minimum standards
- Increasing quantity and quality of equipment and materials
- Supporting special and experimental programs
- Emphasizing individual instruction
- Improving instruction in the academic subject areas

The broad base of priorities within each State reflects (1) the State's educational goals, (2) the total general educationa needs in the 12 critical subject areas treated in title III, (3) special instructional needs which title III may serve in a State, (4) special requirements for equipment and facilities in each of the subject fields and the grade levels to be served, and (5) the categories of eligible equipment, materials, and type of minor remodeling allowable under the State standards developed to enhance instructional programs. However stated, the priorities established in each State provide the basis for a systematic attack on weaknesses in educational programs and permit adjustment as conditions change.

In the northeastern States, program goals and priorities were based on needs assessment, State testing programs, and the judgment of experienced supervisory personnel in the academic subjects. For example, reading was set as the highest priority for NDEA title III projects in Maine. This decision was reached after a study of the reading results in the Maine Assessment of Education Programs showed that Maine children are below the national average in some aspects of reading. This decision was also prompted by the Maine Right to Read program which has expanded from 11 to 17 sites, and used primarily to provide inservice training for teachers in the teaching of reading.

Priorities in Rhode Island wer also based on a State testing program. Reading and mathematics were identified as the two highest priorities and a number of projects were funded in these areas. Priorities in New York were also for projects in reading and mathematics, with bilingual educationa and additional priority for those communities where it was appropriate. Additional consideration was given to proposals which demonstrated comprehensive planning. Among the other criteria considered in project approval were:

- Degree to which program activities relate to identified educational needs

- Degree to which a relationship is shown between equipment or materials requested and their potential use in instruction in the academic subjects

- Degree to which requested materials and equipment will enrich course content or expand the curriculum

- Degree to which requested materials and equipment provide for individualized instruction

- Degree to which prevailing applicable standards in any of the affected academic areas might be realized or exceeded.

Each State plan must include principles from which priorities are to be developed. This means that a State must provide a list of principles which reflect its major educational concerns in the critical subject fields and which have a bearing on the functioning of the title III program. Such principles are then used as a basis for the development of priorities. The priorities themselves, while not a required part of the State plan, must be prepared by the State to be used in a predetermined way for the purpose of assigning relative importance and order of approval of projects submitted by local educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment and materials and for minor remodeling.

Pennsylvania reported eight NDEA title III goals, each an outgrowth of generalized findings from review of past programs, needs assessment data, and current trends in education. From these goals it then established priorities for fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 which served to rank the relative importance and order of approval of projects submitted by local educational agencies. The following are some of Pennsylvania's priority statements on the basis of which special projects were funded:

- Projects which can document real need as a result of a systematic needs assessment.

- Projects which show evidence and commitment to a systematic management-by-objectives approach.

- Projects written in support of significant education change. This includes planned program description utilizing open-space classrooms, extended school year, independent study and/or experimental programs.

- Projects that demonstrate a relationship between the Department of Education's quality assessment project and the purchase of equipment and materials.

- Projects that reflect a concern for the Secretary of Education's curriculum priorities, namely,

  a. Political and Legal Education
  b. Environmental Education
  c. Consumer Education
  d. Fine Arts

- Projects that reflect a national concern for such programs as:

  a. Right to Read
  b. Career Education

c. Bilingual Education
d. Metric System

Minor remodeling was given a low priority by nearly all of the northeastern States. The chief reason for this was the problem of determining eligibility since local edcuational agencies often prefer to assume such costs themselves rather than get into the complications of documenting eligible costs. Rhode Island, for example, reported only one project involving minor remodeling, that of some work done on a greenhouse used in the biology program at Middletown High School.

Program goals and priorities in the southeastern States ranged from the identification of specific acacemid areas as needing priority consideration to broad and comprehensive statements of curriculum needs. Florida recognizing that inequalities in resources exist at the local level in terms of quantity, age, durability, and suitability of equipment and materials on hand, shifted from requiring local agencies to identify priority needs based on accreditation standards to a system based on priority program needs as identified through comprehensive educational planning. The chief objective was to make suitable equipment, materials, and facilities available to children and teachers in the public schools of Florida for the purpose of improving instruction in the academic subjects.

While goals and priorities from most of the States were broad and general in tone, District of Columbia identified some specific areas of concentration, among which were the promotion of language arts in an attempt to improve written and oral composition; the introduction of the study of metric measurement in grades K-12; and the offering of language in primary grades, so as to promote a wise choice of a modern foreign language for in-depth study at the later junior high level.

Improvement of instruction was an over-riding goal in all areas of the country, although a divergence in subject matter to be stressed was noted. Puerto Rico, for example, planned an expansion and improvement of teaching of industrial arts, English, mathematics, science, social studies and music, while South Carolina was one of many concentrating on improvement of basic reading and mathematics skills. South Carolina also focused on the utilization of title III funds to reduce the dropout rate and to reduce failure in first grade.

Puerto Rico, in addition to its improved teaching goal, listed as priorities the organization of new laboratories for science and industrial arts and the remodeling of existing facilities and support for an innovative curriculum for its year round school program in 6 districts.

States in the Upper Midwest listed broad-based program goals under three categories: (1) improvement of instruction, (2) improvement of supervisory and related services, and (3) improvement through the acquisitions program. In the first category, Kansas and Wisconsin aimed to encourage and assist school districts in evaluating their general education programs by providing evaluation instruments and strategies. Michigan and Wisconsin planned to work with local educational agencies in initiating procedures for the use of title III funds in bringing about needed changes in the critical subject areas. In the second category, that of improving supervisory services, Kansas planned to provide additional subject specialists to serve a greater number of districts, while Kansas, North Dakota and Wisconsin all hoped to work with colleges and universities in planning programs that would upgrade teacher competencies. To realize the third goal of improvement through acquisitions, Missouri and Minnesota saw their role as that of assisting schools in the processing of specialized equipment, such as computers for computer assisted instruction, and video equipment. All Upper Midwestern States planned to provide up-to-date information about new techniques and materials through publications, workshops, conferences and on-site visits. To realize goals in these three broad categoies, States set priorities around which local school districts could plan projects, if need for such existed in a given district. Following is a list of representative priorities and States:

Computer assisted Instruction	Minnesota
Individualizing Instruction	Illinois
Instructional Television	Missouri
Specific subject areas:	
Mathematics	Illinois, Indiana
Music	Kansas
Reading	Indiana, Kansas
Projects addressed to critical educational needs of districts with low financial resources	Michigan, Minnesota
Projects designed to upgrade the collections of audiovisual materials and equipment holdings to support critical subject areas and to bring the school's holdings up to minimum standards levels.	Minnesota, Nebraska

NDEA title III administrators of the agencies in the West generally had well thoughtout program goals, achieveable through the establishment of priorities and development of quality local projects which were coordinated with projects from other State and local funds.

American Samoa, which was forced to rely on television as the principal means of instruction over a period of some years, reported that considerable time and a full focus of Federal and Department funds will be required to achieve its program goals, which were listed as: improvement of instructional procedures to enhance the development of pupils' cognitive skills in all academic areas; development of intellectual independence on the part of pupils, exhibiting an ability to question, experiment, hypothesize and form conclusions based on data; and development of a sense of responsibility and pride in schools as evidenced by proper care, maintenance, and utilization of materials and equipment. It is hoped that these goals will be achieved by encouraging students to participate in process-oriented instructional activities, designed to develop inquiry skills. Teachers on their part will be encouraged to rely less on the lecture method and more on classroom discussion and participation.

The State of Washington set two broad program goals: to improve educational programs through the acquisition of equipment and materials in the 12 critical subject areas; and to increase the participation of school districts in the NDEA program by 10% for fiscal year 1974. For the first-named goal, it reported that reading at the elementary level continued to be high priority, with science at the secondary school level. Its second goal, that of increasing program participation, was not realized for several reasons, chief of which was levying failure throughout the State. Many school districts could not meet the 50% matching requirement.

Program goals in Alaska, designed to initiate and/or expand special curricula and programs for certain specific groups of children, remained unchanged from previous years. Of nine projects approved in fiscal year 1974, eight were designed to strengthen individualized instruction in reading, mathematics and social studies. One project upgraded equipment and software in a media center to improve individualized instruction.

6. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM GOALS

Reports from State educational agencies are designed to provide evidence of the achievement of program goals established for the NDEA title III program and the degree of each goal. Degree of achievement is sometimes difficult to measure, based as it must be on subjective as well as objective evidence. Then, too, degree of attainment is frequently controlled by the specificity, or lack thereof, of the goal itself.

Perhaps the ultimate question to be asked is, "Has instruction been improved and strengthened"? To this, most States would seem to answer in the affirmative.

New Hampshire reported that its goal of establishing consultant and advisory services was achieved to a reasonable degree. The seven subject specialists each conducted a minimum of 20 visits to local school districts in connection with the development of NDEA title III projects. The English and reading consultant cooperated closely with the State Right to Read Director in conducting inservice training sessions at New Hampshire's 12 local Right to Read Centers. The mathematics and science consultants held two conferences for 300 elementary and secondary school teachers on new developments in their respective fields. Both consultants also worked in cooperation with the University of New Hampshire to organize a summer institute for 30 elementary school mathematics teachers.

Vermont was another northeastern State reporting success with the role of consultants. In fiscal year 1974, five consultants in the academic subjects participated on a part-time basis in the administration of the NDEA title III program. It was the role of these consultants to provide expertise and technical assistance to the teachers and administrators in local schools. The consultants became involved in instructional programs in mathematics, science, English and reading, industrical arts, and the arts and humanities. Industrial arts was the subject that received the greatest degree of assistance in the use of new types of equipment.

From Connecticut came this statement"

> Effective achievement of our program goals was hampered by the withholding of funds and subsequent sudden release of allotments for two years. Local educational agencies were not prepared to develop good projects so suddenly. Less experimentation and planning was in evidence than in prior years.

A more sanguine report came from Pennsylvania, which furnished information concerning achievement of program goals in several of the academic subjects.

> Arts and Humanities -- There was an increase of eight percent in the number of projects funded over previous years. Most of the projects involved the acquisition of reference and audiovisual materials for interdisciplinary curriculum development.

Modern Foreign Languages -- Priority was given to projects supporting advanced levels of study, middle school foreign language programs, and bilingual programs.

Science -- Thirty school districts upgraded the quality and quantity of science equipment. Fifty districts began participation in the State Nuclear Science Project in fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Social Studies -- The majority of projects in history were requests for audiovisual equipment reflecting the increased use of a multimedia approach to learning. Civics projects were designed to develop and expand legal-political education. Only one economics project was funded an interdisciplinary project in consumer and career education. The number of projects in geography was twice the number expected. Most dealt with rural-urban problems, natural resources, and the environment.

Southeastern States reported a fair amount of progress toward achievement of program goals credited purchase of equipment with NDEA title III funds for the realization of program goals. Among those listed were speech improvement through the use of tape recorders for setting standards and monitoring; individualized instruction in a reading laboratory for reading improvement through the learning of comprehension and reading skills; introduction to metric instruction, and the exploration of foreign language study.

Mississippi had as one of its goals the acquisition of instructional materials and equipment as a part of the program to upgrade the accreditation of schools. Although accreditation for higher classification is not solely dependent upon the holding of equipment and instructional materials, the availability of these items definitely have an influence on accreditation when compiled with the implementation of the instructional program. The data presented below relating to the increase in higher classification for both elementary and secondary schools in Mississippi for the year 1973-74 over the year 1970-71 reflect the impact of the availability and utilization of instructional materials and equipment.

MISSISSIPPI ACCREDITATION STATUS REPORT

Elementary Schools

	1970-1971	1973-1974
Schools awarded Class AA	132	207
Schools awarded Class A	282	315
Schools awarded Accredit	226	109

Secondary Schools

	1970-1971	1973-1974
Schools awarded Class AA	120	171
Schools awarded Class A	163	159

EQUIPMENT HOUSED IN FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	1971-1972		1972-1973		1973-1974	
	NUMBER	NUMBER PER PUPIL	NUMBER	NUMBER PER PUPIL	NUMBER	NUMBER PER PUPIL
Microfilm Readers	498	.0003	638	.0004	763	.0005
Filmstrip Projector	24,333	.0165	27,181	.0179	33,908	.0220
Opaque Projector	2,537	.0017	2,655	.0018	2,780	.0018
Overhead Projector	24,802	.0168	27,369	.0181	29,770	.0194
Slide Projector	6,319	.0043	6,333	.0042	6,741	.0044
8mm Projector	2,748	.0019	3,482	.0023	3,747	.0024
16mm Projector	9,526	.0065	10,484	.0069	11,049	.0072
Radios	3,002	.0020	2,814	.0019	3,130	.0020
Record Players	39,279	.0266	41,975	.0277	43,643	.0284
Tape Recorders-A	24,980	.0169	31,354	.0207	36,762	.0239
Tape Recorders-V	564	.0004	663	.004	785	.0005

MEDIA MATERIALS HOUSED IN FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
(DOES NOT INCLUDE DISTRICT CENTER HOLDINGS 1971-1973)
(DOES INCLUDE DISTRICT CENTER HOLDINGS 1973-1974)

	1971-1972		1972-1973		1973-1974	
	NUMBER	NUMBER PER PUPIL	NUMBER	NUMBER PER PUPIL	NUMBER	NUMBER PER PUPIL
Films - 16mm	4,274	.002	4,971	.003	9,176	.0060
Filmstrips	1,355,879	.93	1,516,296	1.021	1,675,729	1.0896

	1971-1972		1972-1973		1973-1974	
	Number	Number Per Pupil	Number	Number Per Pupil	Number	Number Per Pupil
Globes	32,183	.02	33,947	.023	34,699	.023
Tapes	11,921	.008	13,109	.009	14,095	.009
Slides	444,975	.30	549,895	.370	643,164	.418
Transparencies	827,972	.57	968,823	.652	1,056,950	.687
Books	15,002,151	10.27	15,909,974	10.714	16,426,163	10.680
Magazines	78,858	.05	81,400	.055	81,374	.052
Newspapers	5,425	.004	5,420	.004	5,339	.003

Puerto Rico reported that its first priority area was the organization of new laboratories for science and industrial arts, and the remodeling of existing facilities. Forty-six new industrial arts laboratories were established. Twenty-two of these were in urban senior high schools, 13 in urban junior high schools, and 11 in rural junior high schools. Fifty-seven existing laboratories were equipped in order to provide for program diversification by the addition of the following courses: basic electricity, power mechanics, manufacturing, graphic arts and electronics. Eight laboratories were established for the teaching of the world of construction. In the area of science, 45 laboratories were remodeled and 919 science kits were provided for 541 elementary schools.

Concentration in those same two areas also met with success in South Carolina, where first priority was improved achievement in the basic skills of reading and mathematics. The following figures indicate percentage changes in acquisitions in reflecting the increased use of title III NDEA funds in these critical areas. Expenditures for equipment and materials in the area of reading increased from 157 to 327. In the area of mathematics, expenditures increased from 4% to 7%.

A number of States in the Upper Midwest reported success of program goals statistically -- among them South Dakota, which reported that "80% of our school districts completed application for NDEA title III-A funds to be used to strengthen instruction in 2 academic fields", while Wisconsin also quantified that in addition to the publication of 12 curriculum guides (elsewhere mentioned in this report), 59 communications media in the form of newsletters, bulletins, slides and tapes were prepared and made available to schools within the State. Improvement in instruction, realized through the acquisition program, was claimed by Missouri, placing at 894 the number of requests from project applications for television equipment: VTR, Receiver/Monitor, camera; while Minnesota read achievement into a statistic that showed that 25% of its schools participating in NDEA title III-A had purchased 125 computer terminals.

A long felt need -- acquisition of instructional materials and equipment -- was met with the enactment of NDEA title III. Consequently many States, like Florida, stated as a major objective "to make available usable and suitable equipment, materials and facilities to the children and teachers in the public schools". The following tables reflect gains in the numbers and percentages of pieces of equipment and materials in the past three years. These figures reflect equipment and materials housed in schools; they do not reflect holdings in district and regional media centers.

Workshops, published curriculum guides, mini-courses, evaluations -- all were reported by States using these means to achieve the umbrella goal of 'improvement of instruction'. Both Wisconsin and Illinois met with success, as excerpts from their reports indicate:

Illinois

> "Nine regional workshops, planned and conducted, were designed to inform and encourage local educational agencies to begin individualized programs of instruction. Each workshop was attended by more than 100 teachers and administrators. An outgrowth of these sessions was a statewide music conference devoted to individualizing music instruction."
>
> "Eighteen new foreign language programs have been implemented at the elementary and junior high level as a result of the efforts of the foreign language specialist."

Wisconsin

> "In the area of curriculum development, revision, implementation and evaluation 12 new curriculum guides and/or mini-courses were developed, and 252 meetings were conducted regarding implementation and evaluation."
>
> "A total of 52 evaluations were made. In addition 5 state-wide surveys were conducted. 3,669 NDEA III projects were evaluated. State-wide assessment in mathematics, reading science and social studies were continued."

A major goal in some States was to provide consultant service to assist local personnel in the effective use of new equipment and materials acquired under the program, or to give aid in improving and strengthening instruction. In Nebraska, "An effort was made to work with administrators and teachers as they requested NDEA title III assistance. Frequent consultations were held with architects as new structures were being planned or as remodeling was being considered. The series of Media Family Affairs, held in conjuction with the ESEA title II program, made possible informed consultation with media personnel concerning instruction in the classroom and supply of materials and equipment ..."

Kansas, citing a decline in number of staff positions, stated that it was impossible to supervise all of the academic subject areas in fiscal year 1974.

Indiana viewed pre-program planning, cooperatively performed by State and local personnel, as making "the greatest impact, especially in the areas of mathematics and reading".

Texas had reported a program goal in the social studies area: history, civics, geography and economics. It expended considerable effort to achieve an upgrading in course content and improvement in instruction, and reported a measure of success through 75 on-site consultative visits.and/or workshops, involving approximately 1,500 curriculum leaders and/or teachers; in mathematics it realized a goal of individualizing instruction by establishing mathematics laboratories and encouraging the use of wider variety of materials. Montana and Puerto Rico both had program goals involving the upgrading of industrial arts classes. Montana was particularly approving of the response it received --projects were approved to the amount of $130,775. Of this sum, $6,092 was spent on the elementary school level. Utah, for example, realized only a token achievement, naming severe limitations on Federal funding as a prime cause. Montana also reported a curtailment in program achievement because of limited funding.

Turning to reports from southeastern States, Mississippi cites a continuing project involving the use of educational television in Calhoun County that involves two elementary schools, two junior high schools and two senior high schools. The superintendent has the overall responsibility for the project and is aware of all of the technical, administrative and instructional aspects. The principals are responsible to him for the effectiveness of the program in their schools. Each participating school has a full-time coordinator who makes videotapes, schedules equipment, and provides materials and services to teachers. The coordinator operates from the school media center where the recording equipment and monitor are housed. The program was initiated in the three elementary schools in 1970 - 71, extended to the intermediate grades, and in 1974 was introduced into the high schools. The elementary schools are wired for television. Programs are received via antenna and are recorded in and distributed from the media centers. Videotapes are played over the distribution system or played in the classroom on a videocassette play unit. Also, programs are received in the classroom by open air broadcast at the time they are aired over the network. The equipment acquired by the project includes eight videocassette play units mounted on portable stands along with a television receiver and monitor. This combination of equipment is referred to as a "video-roll-about". The high schools have access to programs by "roll-about". This project was developed in cooperation with the Mississippi Authority for Educational Television after the administrative staff of the local education agency had made a careful study of curriculum needs and the instructional resources available to schools over the State television network. The plan as outlined allows for continued expansion of the program as the need and interest indicate and as funds are available.

The plan includes in-service training for teachers in technical and instructional areas. Principals have participated in workshops to prepare them for their role. At this time more than 30 instructional series are used regularly.

The relationship between hearing and learning as it applies to the English/ language arts formed the basis of a project reported from Fairfax County, Virginia. Their division-wide elementary English - special education project provided basic, intermediate and advanced Central Auditory Abilities Training Programs which present pre-planned, systematic, sequential programs for development and/or refinement of essential auditory perceptual skills, The programs are taped and designed for use with an open-reel tape recorder. A specially designed speaker with an intensity calibrating unit included, enhances the quality of the sound reproduction. Auditory perceptual skills are critical to success in English/language arts. Inability of a child to attend selectively to auditory stimuli, to discriminate between sounds, to establish stable sound-symbol relationships, to store and retrieve verbal input rapidly, and to interpret verbal language accuragely, preclude the development of efficient English/language arts skills. The flexibility of the format and the adaptability of the content of the project materials permit a wide application of the training programs to a variety of special education students. The project provides appropriate in-service training in the use of the programs. A Central Auditory Program Development Specialist provides consultative service as needed. This project provided $43,317 to 1,114 students in 44 schools in Fairfax County. In Minnesota the State Department of Education was allotted funds in 1973 to organize an Educational Computer Consortium which would be available to all the schools in the State. The State also leased lines and computers. This then became a high priority item to serve all schools. NDEA title III aided schools in purchasing the low speed terminals located in the schools that relayed instructional information to students.

Rochester, Minnesota received aid to purchase 16 terminals. Three are located in elementary schools serving approximately 1,200 pupils. Highly interesting English programs of creative drill and practice programs written by local teachers were fed into the terminal. These programs created a motivation that could in no other way be implemented. Several curriculum development teams were formed to map future use of the computer in the classroom.

Minnetonka, Minnesota, bought a Porta Com (portable computer terminal) which was used at Scenic Heights Elementary School serving 462 pupils. Computer applications included use of the Hewlett-Packard Arithmetic Drill and Practice, simulations, computer generated materials, and programming in the BASIC Language. Since this school also served as a student teacher center fro the University of Minnesota during the 1974-75 school year, the University sponsored a "Computers in the Elementary School" workshop which was attended by 22 teachers from several elementary schools in the district.

7. IMPLEMENTATION OF GOALS IN NDEA TITLE III PROJECTS

All States and Outlying Areas used allotments in fiscal year 1973 and 1974 to fund projects that illustrate the implementation of both management and program goals. The following descriptions of selected projects indicate the effects of the equipment acquired and the minor remodeling performed, on strengthening instruction in the academic subjects. Project descriptions tend to show that what were mere beginning trends in education when the NDEA title III program was initiated have now become accepted practice on an over-widening scale. What is referred to here is an increase in utilization of educational technologies and a greater use of the interdisciplinary approach in classrooms.

Projects in the natural sciences and reading continued to be popular. The annual reports also referred frequently to projects uniting the social studies with the humanities, and to mathematics projects concerned with the introduction of the metric system.

There appeared to be increasing interest in several northeastern States in art and music projects. The New Hampshire report made specific references to minor remodeling projects that improved studio and practice areas for music and art groups while Connecticut funded several music programs for children in the elementary and middle schools which stressed the opportunity for children to discover and create music for themselves. NDEA title III-A assisted in the acquisition of such necessary instruments as bells, cymbals and drums.

As schools have searched for innovation and ways to break out of the rigid, structured and stratified patterns of the past, the interdisciplinary approach has been developed, whereby themes can be explored in a multiciplicity of ways that transcend the traditional course barrier. Music and indeed all the arts, especially lend themselves to this kind of planning and teaching.

An interesting interdisciplinary project in Delaware in the Alfred I. DuPont School District involved the exploration of four art forms -- drawing and painting, music, dance, and the drama -- from the 17th century to the present to study the question: Why does man create? Pupils traced the development of creative styles produced in each period. Evaluative techniques for the project were related to the ability of each pupil to accomplish stated objectives. Similar projects were reported for several States that related the work of artists to political and social movements of the times as well as to the music and literature of the periods covered.

All of the northeastern States reported English and reading as subjects ranking very high in number of projects funded, or high in total expenditures. Pennsylvania, for example, used NDEA title III funds to assist in the support of twelve Right to Read Centers and to contribute to the support of 44 other reading programs in individual schools. Typical reading projects include an individualized reading program in Somersworth, New Hampshire and a diagnostic and prescription clinic in District #3, Central Harlem, New York City.

Several States reported reading projects related to career education. Children are exposed to good quality writing about actual people performing jobs in realistic surroundings. The materials used often introduce non-traditional jobs or those often taken for granted. Efforts are made to find reading materials that give good representation to minorities and to women in nontraditional jobs.

Midwood High School in New York City has used video and film-making techniques in English and reading classes and reports a marked increase in notivation among habitually underachieving pupils and heightened creativity among gifted pupils. Pupils are involved in virtually every aspect of television production, from scriptwriting to visiting the studios of a major network, to preparation of a public service drug abuse announcement.

The American Bicentennial year provided a theme in which traditional curriculum barriers were croseed over -- most frequently in art, music, English, reading, and the social studies. Reports indicated a great variety of high quality materials used in connection with these projects, e.g., films of major comtemproary events, and representative American novels and short stories; recordings of American history in ballads, songs, and poetry; and new books that give comprehensive comparisons of life in the city, and the suburbs, and the rural areas of the United States.

A project utilizing games in teaching history was funded in the high school at Farmington, New Hampshire. Using heuristic games, pupils are able to replicate court room experiences, and examine institutional - individual conflict.

The social studies field also provided opportunities for the up-dating of "old" courses and the introduction of new areas of study reflecting current concerns, as in Pennsylvania where the title III coordinator reported:

> Funds available in the social studies have enabled new programs to be implemented in economics which deal with consumerism, in history to permit the development of oral history programs, in civics to expand offerings in legal and political education, and in geography to support studies dealing with urban and rural problems, environmental concerns, and the status of our natural resources which is becoming so important in the current energy crisis.

Metric education continued to demand a share of NDEA title III funds and attention as the nation moves towards conversion to the metric system. A characteristic project in metric education is one funded for schools in the Conrad Area School District in Delaware. Project objectives included acquisition of information about the metric system and the application of skills in using and converting measures. Manipulative materials were acquired to provide activities to reinforce the concepts presented. The classroon project was supported by summer inservice programs sponsored by the Delaware Department of Public Instruction to assist teachers in making a gradual transition to the metric system.

From many States came reporting projects in the social studies and in science dealing with environmental and energy projects. Pupils explored the present and future status of various sources of energy; processed coal, shale, oil, geothernal heart, nuclear fission, wind, and solar heat. The environmental and social consequences of the use of these various sources of energy are covered.

Industrial arts was the last of the academic subjects to be made eligible under NDEA title III, becoming eligible in 1967. Relatively few projects have been funded because of more critical needs in other subjects and because of the expense of some of the highly complex types of equipment needed for instructional purposes in industrial arts; however, Pennsylvania approved 172 projects in industrial arts in fiscal years 1973 and 1974, amounting to nearly $2 million in expenditures. The introduction of new units in exploratory courses in industrial arts is the type of project most frequently funded. For example, Rutland, Vermont has expanded its exploratory courses to include drafting, woodworking, power/automotive, general metals/welding, and electricity. Another frequently mentioned need is that of equipment and facilities for offering junior high and middle school industrial arts courses to girls.

Technology in greater or lesser degree has been a built-in part of many of the programs described in preceding paragraphs. Several instances of in-depth technology were cited by various schools around the country. Hillsboro County School District in Florida, e.g., described a project which provided approximately $140,000 worth of instructional equipment and materials for a new elementary school with a unique center organized according to the needs of the students. The instrucitonal program employs continuous evaluation and development of learning presecriptions on an individual basis. Subject areas involved include the arts, humanities, civics, economics, English, geography, history, mathematics, modern foreign language, reading, and science.

Rockdale County, Georgia, used fiscal year 1974 NDEA title III funds to establish an industrial arts program at the junior high school level. The industrial arts program is an exploratory area in the course of study which serves for both career exploration activities and a foundation for certain trade courses at the comprehensive high school.

An example of the use of NDEA title III funds for reading improvement -- this one utilizing books and print material rather than technology -- comes from Spartanburg, South Carolina, where program funds made possible the individualization of the teaching of reading.

Significant results in the improvement of reading skills are being obtained by approximately 475 K-5 pupils enrolled at Jesse S. Bobo Elementary School. The basal reading program in the district uses 12 levels of materials. Each level has an accompanying criterion test which is given at the completion of that level. Supplementary materials of all kinds are used to extend and reinforce the skills being developed in the basal program.

District of Columbia was among those school systems where technology was utilized in the teaching of English. One pilot project had as its purpose the improvement of composition skills; another, the improvement of speech. In the latter program, students at Spingarn High and at Phelps and Bell Vocational High Schools, used tape recorders to monitor progress, setting their own standards and measurements for speech improvement. The project to improve composition skills was designed to allow teachers to grade written assignments on tape, whereby was provided an opportunity for constructive comments. The Department of English held two city-wide orientation meetings to instruct English teachers in how to use the tape recorders in the classroom. A guide. "Grading Compositions Using Tapes" was produced and disseminated for use. The major emphasis for the project was placed on the interrelationship of the language arts and in particular the improvement of composition, both written and oral.

Rockingham County in North Carolina has developed a reading program which is designed to eliminate the "crippling disability of reading failure and replace it with reading success". The project uses a diagnostic - prescriptive approach by which students who have fallen below level in both attitudes and reading achievement can have a program planned for their specific needs. Each prescription becomes the basis for establishing performance goals, and programming includes complete perceptual training, encompassing the basic motor skills, hand-eye coordination, visual and auditory perception training and discrimination. This reading program uses modern multimedia techniques and a wide variety of approaches designed to build interest in learning to read. The varied approaches involve the student in visual, auditory, kinesthetic, perceptual and motor skills, to develop comprehension and improve spelling and vocabulary. The project is designed to enable the students to become the "discoverers" and thus to build the positive attitudes necessary for effective learning. The closed circuit television equipment made possible by NDEA title III funds is used to enhance student ability to express themselves and provide balance between the comprehension and skills aspect and the techniques of oral and written communication.

The city school system of Birmingham, Alabama, was another that chose to channel a portion of NDEA title III funds into projects designed to improve education in music for grades 1-12. During the 2-year period, over $60,000 was expended for music education. The promotion of music education projected through the entire Birmingham system has been under the direction of a capable full-time music supervisor who worked closely with subject matter specialists in the Department of Education and the administrative staff of NDEA title III. This supervisor has been actively engaged in conducting teacher workshops throughout the system. While the focus in this music project has been primarily on the lower grades, the emphasis on music in all grades reflects one of the identified priorities of the State education agency -- the promotion of projects involving the arts and humanities in grades one through twelve.

Oral history, developed by professional historians with interviews on tape of famous writers, personages and historical characters, stored in the Library of Congress and available in major libraries, now has its counterpart on a local level in many of our schools. Projects of this nature, centering on local history, have been reported from the Upper Midwest region. One such comes from Shawano, Wisconsin where a tape library has been developed for use as a resource in several special programs: "History of Menomiee-Shawano Counties", "Minorities in America", "American Indian Philosophy", and "A History of Native Americans". All of the tapes in this library have been developed by students through interviews with people representing various facets of community life, culture and history. Accompanying the tape library is the school's original video library, made by students filming lumbermail operations in Menomiee County for use of grades 2 and 4, and at the high school level; the filming of Indian pow-wows for utilization in a social studies sequence; the filming of community activities for use in grade 2; and the filming of community sequences for use in celebrating the American Bicentennial. The State Coordinator summed up the value of this program in these words:

> Perhaps of greatest importance is the development of new and different methodologies that students are using as they conduct interviews and use the community resources around them. Further, the use of "tape libraries" is accepted as a significant resource in the Shawano schools. District No. 8 is exhibiting leadership in this area, particularly as the social studies program is developing data for courses where material acquisition is virtually impossible--student materials on the Menominees.

Besides the above, this project is serving at least two additional functions:

- Improving the social studies program in Shawano
- Solidifying ideas that might be transported to other Wisconsin schools

A geography project in Columbia Elementary Schools, Hammond, Indiana, was used to foster in students an understanding of physical and cultural distribution patterns throughout the world. Active participation of the 323 enrolled students, grades K-5, was encouraged in learning situations requiring involvement through the inductive approach. NDEA title III funds purchased a variety of maps, globes and specialized geographical media that were used for individualized study as well as for small group and classroom activities.

Small school systems in the past have found it difficult to fund courses other than those required for graduation. Dexter, Kansas, having fewer than 200 students in grades K-12, was enabled through NDEA title III to expand its music program to include the study of folk music, jazz, and church music, and to provide a complete listening center and a number of folk instruments. To the program was added an extra fillip -- 4 elementary and 4 secondary school students joined their teachers in planning the project. From the Parkway School System in Missouri came a report of NDEA title III funds used to expand a piano laboratory which the school system had originally piloted with its own funds. It is an electronic piano system with a master (teacher) piano connected with a number of practice pianos. The teacher may monitor any piano at will. All pianos may be in the same room, since only the user can hear the piano he is playing. The district estimates that the laboratory will serve 432 students each semester of the school year, and half that number during the summer sessions.

At Glenbrook High School, Cook County, Illinois, an art program in jewelry making and sculpture utilized title III funds to individualize teaching. The purchase of a melting furnance, a cutting and welding set, a glass bead blaster, and a polisher added flexibility to a program in which 170 students participated -- four sections in jewelry and two in sculpture.

Games and manipulative devices available for purchase under title III have been used with effectiveness in several of the critical areas, perhaps none more so than in the social studies field.

As if to demonstrate that this kind of teaching and learning can take place in a small rural school as well as in a large urban one, Nebraska reported a developing course in the humanities:

> Waterloo, a small community to the west of the city of Omaha, had in fiscal year 1974 a total enrollment of only 273 students, K-12. As is customary in systems of this size, emphasis was continually being placed on those subjects required for graduation with little opportunity for emphasis on the arts and humanities. A project for less than $500 was approved for NDEA title III reimbursement to "increase musical awareness in the students - to incorporate music appreciation, music history, and music listening". The project director saw in the project opportunities "to incorporate art, literature, history and music - to develop in total a humanities exploration course."

Wheeling Elementary School District #21, Cook County, Illinois also provides an example of an operational industrial arts program on the junior high school level:

> In 1974, Wheeling School District #21 planned and put into operation a new industrial arts program in three existing junior high schools. Their general objectives related to (1) manipulation experiences, (2) exploratory experiences, (3) consumer wisdom, (4) avocations utilization of shop related knowledge and (5) social development. The content of the courses offered fell into five categories: (1) drafting, (2) woods, (3) electricity, (4) metals and (5) plastics. Since no program existed, basic equipment of more than $37,000 was required. NDEA title III provided more than $15,000 of these costs. More than 2,000 students are now enrolled in industrial arts classes.

Another program whose efficacy is credited to the use of NDEA title III funds was initiated in a 'disadvantaged' school district in Auburndale, Wisconsin. This program is designed to improve student competency in mathematics through the use of concrete and manipulative materials. Students are tested diagnostically, and individualized use of the project purchased materials is made to help students overcome identified deficiencies.

For the first time in the history of this disadvantaged school district teachers have available for their use elementary mathematics laboratory materials. Guided by lead teachers with special training and preparation, they utilize the materials to provide review and reinfercement of learned mathematical concepts and skills.

In addition to purchasing special materials with NDEA title III and local funds, the project coordinator set up a summer workshop for teachers to help them become expert in the instructional use of such materials. Special inservice sessions for staff members were also held. As a result, the NDEA title III supported materials are being utilized effectively in this school.

Projects in science illustrative of the successful implementation of management and program goals covered a wide range of choices, including curriculum revision, installation of laboratories, environmental studies, human ecology, and provision of 'hands on' equipment and materials. Animas and Taos in New Mexico, e.g., both small rural school districts with very poor science facilities, used NDEA title III funds to provide equipment for newly constructed science laboratories.

Monroe, Wisconsin, designed an ambitous summer program on environmental studies and human ecology. Representatives of curriculum-crossing projects, it began with 13 specific objectives, incorporating elements of science, social studies, the arts and humanities, and English-language arts, and aimed at the goal of increasing the student's environmental awareness and sensitivity.

Basic to the program was the study of local community problems and issues ranging from water quality in nearby lakes and streams to planning a model city, a "New Monroe". Local resource persons such as the city park director, city assessor, city forester, and Department of Natural Resources personnel assisted in the six week program.

Much of the equipment acquired through the project was for conducting water quality tests. Without this equipment this phase of the project would have been impossible. Both local and State news media were attracted to the project as indicated by the attached news articles.

A camera acquired through the project was utilized not only in recording project activities but in environmental aesthetic quality studies in natural and man-made environments.

The project will be repeated during the summer of 1975.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs used title III monies to strengthen the biological and earth science curricula at the Wahpeton Elementary Boarding School in Wahpeton, North Dakota, and to improve the quality of the science laboratory at Flandreau Indian High School. These two projects were closely correlated as graduates of Wahpeton go on to Flandreau. It is hoped that children participating in the science programs of these schools will be better prepared to enter the Indian Medical Careers Program supported by the U. S. Public Health Service and cooperating universities, or perhaps to go into professional science or science-related career education programs.

California reported having 32 projects in fiscal year 1973 and 16 in fiscal year 1974 in the fields of reading and English. A fairly representative one was that at Golden West College in the Coast Community College District in Costa Mesa. Funded at $8,858, its target population was 600 junior college students. What follows is the project description as reported by California for what was formally titled, "Addio-Tutorial Reading and English":

Goals and Objectives:

The equipment and materials requested in the 1973-74 English-Reading component of our NDEA title III request was to be used to meet three major objectives, primarily via audio-tutorial instruction:

(1) To develop the ability to utilize the SQ3R study-reading system

(2) To develop an adequate ability to recall and retrieve reading material

(3) To develop knowledge of and ability to utilize phonic principles

(4) To develop knowledge of and ability to utilize basic spelling principles

(5) To develop greater feelings of self-worth

Program Description:

Enrollment in reading programs during the fall of 1974 was up 15 percent, and the number of students requiring work on the five above objectives almost doubled. Without the items requested in this funding we would have been unable to provide assistance on an individual basis to the large number of students requiring remedial work in these areas. With the requested equipment and materials we have been able to increase the number of copies of several of our tape programs, thus permitting more students to work on the same program at the same hour; we have been able to add to our offerings a new spelling program, three new phonics programs, three new reading programs, and two new tape programs designed to improve self-confidence and increase feelings of self-worth. In addition, a previously-developed program has been rewritten and amended making it more appropriate for our less-capable students.

Evaluation:

The standards set in the "Evaluation Specifications" section of the funding request have been met by 94 percent of all students working in the programs involved. In cases where 70 percent accuracy was required as a minimum standard to be met, 98 percent of students working with these programs scored at or above the 90 percent accuracy level. The funding of this project has definitely enhanced the quality of the reading program at Golden West College.

A project grant to Washoe County School District in Reno, Nevada, afforded the opportunity of learning approved strategies for classroom instruction in the understanding and use of the metric system, to approximately 800 elementary and secondary school teachers. Presentations on video tapes were designed to be of general interest to adult audiences and were suitable for public distribution at school levels or for public television broadcasts. In addition, other presentations were designed specifically for inservice teacher training and were aimed at specific grade level instructional tasks. This equipment and these materials enhanced the understanding of the change over to the metric system and the attainment of the following objectives:

- To develop skills in staff training presentations
- To provide opportunities for staff presentations to teachers, students, and the public
- To develop an active interest in and an understanding of the metric system

The Case Grande Elementary School District in Arizona received a grant of $6,767 to improve its school science program. Teachers at the Casa Grande Junior High School were convinced that the science curriculum should be a "doing" as opposed to a "reading" one. More "hands-on" materials were clearly needed. The existing program had no laboratory facilities and only limited demonstration equipment. An NDEA title III project requested funds to permit the purchase of equipment and materials that would provide students the opportunity to pursue independent projects and investigations. 1,121 students were directly affected by this program which provided facilities including a weather station, as well as equipment for classroom use. As a result of this grant, mini-programs were developed as supplementary to the regular science program.

A tie-in of the Industrial Arts program with a long-range plan for Career Education is being implemented at Gladstone High School, Gladstone, Oregon. The plan calls for improvement and expansion of the industrial arts program, facilities and equipment, and has community support as evidenced by the recent passage of a bond issue. Part of the bond issue is to be used for an industrial arts and vocational facility. The program thus far has been limited to working in woods, but proposed plans are for an expansion that would include the study of metals and power mechanics.

Finally, a project titled "Computer Mathematics" was funded in San Diego County, California, which served 2,500 students, grades 1-12, in 32 schools. A description of this venture in Computer-Assisted Instruction follows:

Program Goal:

The goal of this program was to improve the mathematical ability of all students involved with the Computer-Assisted Instruction Program and to provide diagnostic and prescriptive management information for classroom.

Program Description:

Students in selected schools were provided with a computer based interactive drill and practice program in mathematics. The computer presented problems from the following content strands -

Number Concepts
Horizontal Addition
Horizontal Subtraction
Vertical Addition
Vertical Subtraction
Equations
Measurement
Horizontal Multiplication
Laws of Arithmetic
Vertical Multiplication
Division
Fractions
Decimals
Negative Numbers

The computer continuously diagnosed and prescribed problems based on the student's responses. Since the computer also maintained a student history for each individual student, this information was also used to select problems matched to each student's level of achievement. At the end of each lesson the computer provided each student with a report of the number of problems attempted and the number and percent correct. The other reports generated were used by the teachers for management purposes.

Evaluation:

The computer based mathematics program was received very favorably. Teachers noted how motivated students were to begin computer lessons, and this interest was maintained throughtout the use of the programs. They also commented that there was a change in behavior of disruptive students after exposure to computer lessons. They tended to be more cooperative and receptive to the teaching/learning process.

> Skills definitely increased for the students who used the program. The computer very quickly determined each student's level through a continuous process of diagnosing and prescribing. Once this level was found, the individual students progressed through the content of the fourteen stands. Progress was consistent for those students who had lessons on a regular basis.

The Sun River School District in Montana designed a project for the teaching of mathematics in the intermediate grades, that while stressing instruction in the metric system also provided materials for a math program of wider range. These materials included metric system packets with filmstrips and cassettes, taped recordings with an auto-mate to provide remedial and enrichment materials on a small group or individual basis, and also geometric models, protractors and compasses for work with angles and spheres.

Cloudcroft, a small mountain district in New Mexico, used NDEA title III funds to implement an individualized social studies program at the secondary level, complete with listening centers, tape recorders and slide projectors.

8. CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF NDEA TITLE III ON EDUCATION

To sum up the cumulative impact of NDEA title III for fiscal years 1973 and 1974, the States cited examples of the program from different school levels and among different types of children with varying learning abilities. These examples tended to show that both successes and weaknesses of the program are the result of management and program provisions built into State plans, e.g., the principles for determining the priority of projects to be approved, the standards for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with NDEA title III funds, and the matching ratios required of local education agencies. Added to the weaknesses for the particular time-span of this report was the delay in funding the program for fiscal year 1973.

Some northeastern States, as did Delaware, credited NDEA title III with strengthening inservice training programs for teachers, especially in the areas of reading, mathematics, science and the humanities. New equipment and technology demanded that teachers be exposed to new techniques and new ideas. The program also brought about comprehensive and long-range planning on the part of local education agencies as they moved to establish and maintain priorities. All agreed that individualized instruction and student participation in the learning process were becoming realizable goals.

The National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, just after the Maine legislature had enacted a law permitting and encouraging the consolidation of school districts. At that time, there were many high schools with fewer than 50 pupils and fewer than four teachers. With NDEA title III funds, the consolidated school districts were able to install in the new high schools science, language, and mathematics laboratories and increase and expand course offerings in these three subjects. Maps, globes, charts, models, and reference books were also purchased. Today, there are only seven high schools in Maine with fewer than 100 pupils; they are "geographically isolated" (three located on islands in the ocean) and unable to combine with other schools. NDEA title III has also helped equip new consolidated elementary schools with science and mathematics equipment and reading and learning centers. Most of this individualization of instruction could not have taken place without NDEA title III funds.

This acquisition of equipment and material has had another result in that it is usually coupled with an incentive to experiment and innovate, thus upgrading the school's educational program. Most States reported the trend from the textbook-oriented classroon to that as described by New York as a learner-responsive, individualized, inquiry-based, process-oriented. Indeed, New York goes even further in declaring that these are "no longer educationally innovative but are structurally inevitable".

New courses have been introduced that 15 years ago would not have been considered in the province of the average public school -- ceramic arts, television production, dance and movement, consumer education, history of the Middle East (and of Africa, and of the USSR), jewerly making, etc. Success has also been reported in the offering of mini-courses -- usually designed for one-half semester programs.

Several southeastern States credited the matching allocations provision of the program as an incentive to raise State standards above the minimal level, while others felt that it militated against the smaller and poorer schools. All agreed that the program had brought about growing inventories of audiovisual materials and sophisticated technological equipment and a concomitant skill in their use on the part of the classroom teacher. Schools now have laboratories where none had existed before in fields as diverse as industrial arts, modern foreign languages, science (including mathematics), reading, the fine arts, and English/language arts. Georgia, in reporting on the overall impact of the NDEA title III program had this to say about the effect of the newer equipment:

> Local school systems in Georgia state that NDEA title III is one of the better programs available to them. These funds enable them to purchase equipment and materials that would not otherwise be available for student use. In the early days of the program some systems purchased equipment without planning. For the past several years, local systems in Georgia have surveyed their needs and, based on these findings, have set priorities for expending the funds. With emphasis being placed on research type teaching, quarter system, and individualization of instruction, there is a greater need for different kinds of equipment and materials, and for increased quantities of existing aids....Educators are recognizing a need to gear the instruction program to the unique needs of the individual student. Science and industrial arts laboratories have been installed in local systems that would not have been possible without the aid of NDEA title III funds. Students and parents are demanding improved instruction, with more and better equipment and materials. One school had purchased some audiovisual materials intending to rely on equipment already on hand for the use of the material. However, there was such a demand for the materials by both students and teachers that more equipment had to be purchased.

On the other hand, Mississippi approved of the 50% local matching program as a means of "helping to insure the wise use of expenditures for instructional materials".

In Colorado the concrete impact of NDEA title III has resulted in:

- Creation of media centers in smaller districts
- Substantial support via additional hard and software in existing print and audiovisual centers
- Increased activity in supporting new curricular programs
- Greater attention given to meeting the needs of students with physical and mental learning disabilities.

When New Mexico summed up the cumulative impact, the three points it made were those stated in one way or another by all States:

- Provided access to materials not otherwise available
- Provided encouragement to use other methods of instruction supplemental to the text
- Upgraded specific academic programs.

Better teaching, individualized instruction and learning, inservice training, minor remodeling from greenhouses to communications laboratories, equipment that includes looms for weaving as well as that needed for computer assisted learning, materials for a new concept in media centers. These and many more are the good things made possible by NDEA title III as reported by the States. Part of Utah's report which follows portrays an accurate picture of the program:

> Program-wise the impact of title III-A has been tremendous. Schools have acquired equipment and materials they would never have had otherwise. Materials have been varied and current and have served the needs of programs. Equipment has been varied and broadened the possibilities in the instructional programs.
>
> New devices and machines have enriched the activities in the academic areas but have also had some impact on other curricular areas.
>
> Project applications in the first years of the program provided an impoverished educational environment. Inventories were so meager that "none", "little", or "poor" were the common evaluations. Laboratory and audiovisual equipment was practically non-existent in all except the large schools.
>
> After fifteen years of acquisition all schools have shown significant gains. Materials and equipment are available and are being used. Much of the funding has gone to replace heavily used items that have worn out in service.
>
> Secondary schools have utilized a greater portion of the funding because of the requirements of many of their programs, particularly in the areas of science and industrial arts laboratory equipment.
>
> Equalization of effort and of opportunity has been attempted since the beginning of the program by providing for variable matching ratios. The districts that were poorer in financial resources received a larger percentages of Federal funding. No district received less than 40% or more than 60%. Relative status on the matching scale has been determined each year according to the relative status of districts in the distribution of the State uniform school funds. While no system or formulation provide completely equitable fund distributions, the variable ratio need

> in our State has been generally accepted as fair and approaching equilization.
>
> In summary, NDEA title III-A has had an important influence on instructional programs during the years it has been operating. It has functioned smoothly and well.

While some States saw adverstty in the matching allocations provision in that it denied smaller schools access to title III funds, most States are moving to rectify that shortcoming by adopting "variable matching". Nebraska points out that variable matching in that State ranged from 57%, 47%, 37%, and 27%, and allowed less able districts to acquire more instructional equipment and materials than would have been possible on a 50-50 matching basis.

American Samoa reported that new equipment and resources made possible "student participation, rather than passivity, in learning", and California reported NDEA title III as putting " instruction tools into the hands of teachers, aides, and students". Missouri expressed much the same idea in other words, "NDEA title III funding makes it possible for teachers to use methods which permit students to be participants rather than mere listeners in their own education".

In some instances the very weaknesses described were a result of the success of the program, as in Alaska where was pointed out the difficultly of keeping up with the demand for instructional materials and equipment as more and more of its schools changed to open concept individualized programs.

California, on the other hand, viewed the program as an unqualified success, even though recognizing the uncertainties caused by the "confused" funding patterns of recent years.

9. LOANS TO PRIVATE NONPROFIT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, FISCAL YEAR 1974

In Fiscal Year 1974, six loans were approved for elementary and secondary schools in five States. Approximately 1,200 students benefitted from these funds. The amount of funds available totaled $250,000 of which $86,740 was approved for elementary and secondary schools. The distribution is shown in Table 9.

Loans were for the acquisition of equipment and instructional materials in the areas of natural sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, history, geography, social sciences, English, and reading, industrial arts, and the arts and humanities. There was minor remodeling in the areas of science, modern foreign languages, and industrial arts. The amounts used in these areas are shown in Table 10.

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

FORM APPROVED
O.M.B. NO. 51-R1072

PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR TITLE III-A OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT, FY 197

(Complete questions 1-6 on a separate sheet or sheets and attach)

1. List the NDEA Title III-A management goals for the fiscal year in which the funds were spent.
2. Describe briefly how these goals fit into comprehensive state education agency planning.
3. List the NDEA Title III-A program goals and priorities for the fiscal year in which the funds were spent.
4. Describe briefly the achievement of each program goal you have listed, and the degree of attainment of each.
5. Describe briefly 3-5 projects illustrative of implementation of your management and program goals, the effects of the of the equipment and materials acquired, and minor remodeling performed to strengthen instruction in the academic subjects.
6. Describe the cumulative impact of NDEA Title III-A on education in the public schools of your State. Cite examples, if you wish, from various school levels and types of children. Relate the effectiveness or weaknesses of the program to management and program goals, and such provisions of the state plan as priorities, matching ratios required of the local educational agencies, standards.

7. COMPLETE THE TABLE BELOW ON STATE NDEA TITLE III-A, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL (a)	NUMBER OF PERSONNEL		TOTAL FTE POSITIONS (d)
	FULL-TIME (b)	PART-TIME (c)	
1. Administrators			
2. Supervisors			
3. Secretary and Clerks			
4. Other			
5. **TOTAL**			

8. COMPLETE THE TABLE ON REIMBURSEMENT RATIOS FOR LOCAL NDEA TITLE III-A PROJECTS

REIMBURSEMENT RATIO (a)	NUMBER OF PROJECTS (b)
1. At 50%	
2. At less than 50%	
3. At more than 50%	
4. **TOTAL**	

TITLE AND SIGNATURE OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER	NAME OF STATE

OE FORM 1298-1, 6/

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this form is to report program performance under NDEA Title III-A during fiscal year 1976. Please submit an original and two copies of this report to the Director, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Definitions

1. "Goals" as used in this form are targets for action or change. The requirements for their achievement can be specified with some certainty.
2. "Management goals" pertain to such facets of administration as staff assignments, disseminating program information, determining allocations, approving project applications.
3. "Program goals" are concerned with such elements as inservice education, strengthening instruction in subject areas, contributing to pupil achievement, supporting curricular change.
4. "Priorities" identify most urgent needs and provide the basis for a systematic attack on weaknesses in educational programs, permitting adjustment as conditions change.
5. "Academic subjects" is defined in §141.1 of the NDEA Title III-A Regulations.
6. "Standards" are means for determining the suitability of equipment or minor remodeling as it relates to the improvement of academic subjects in public elementary and secondary schools.

Instructions

7. Column *(b)* – Enter the number of full-time staff assigned to State administration of the NDEA Title III-A program for each personnel category, whether or not salaries were paid from Title III-A funds.

   Column *(c)* – Enter the number of part-time staff.

   Column *(d)* – Enter the full-time equivalents *(FTE)* of the total of full- and part-time personnel.

   Example: One full-time secretary *(enter "1" in column (b));*

   two part-time secretaries [one at 1/4 time; one at 1/3 time] *(enter "2" in column (c));*

   1.00 + 0.25 + 0.33 = 1.58 FTE
   (enter 1.58 in column (c)).

8. Column *(b)* – Enter the number of approved local educational agency projects reimbursed by the State at various ratios.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

FORM APPROVED
O.M.B. NO. 51-R1073

TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT
FY 197 AND FY 197

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

The purpose of this form is to report the status of NDEA Title III funds for FY 1975 and FY 1976. Submit an original and two copies to:
U.S. Office of Education, Director, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202.

ITEM 1. Preprinted by the U.S. Office of Education (OE).

ITEM 2. Enter the grant number or other identifying number assigned by the Federal grantor organization.

ITEM 3. Enter the name and complete mailing address, including the ZIP code for the grantee organization.

ITEM 4. Enter the employer identification number assigned by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. If the grantee organization has been assigned a DHEW entity number consisting of the IRS employer identification number prefixed by "1" and suffixed by a two-digit number, enter the full DHEW entity number.

ITEM 5. This space is reserved for an account number or other identification numbers which may be assigned by the grantee.

ITEMS 6. and 7. Mark the appropriate boxes.

ITEMS 8 and 9. Preprinted by OE.

Please read before completing Item 10:

Programs –. Functions – Activities

COLUMNS (1)-(5), Page 1, and (1)-(3), Page 2 – Continuation – Enter the total cost of equipment and materials incurred under each subject area. Include matching funds. If actual cost is not available, report estimated amounts in approved applications.

COLUMN (4). "Social studies" includes history, civics, geography ,and economics.

COLUMN (6). Enter the total cost of State administration charged against NDEA Title III-A. Include matching funds, and any indirect costs claimed in Item 11.

COLUMN (4), Page 2 – Continuation – Enter the total cost of minor remodeling. Include matching funds. If actual cost is not available, report estimated amounts in approved applications.

TOTAL COLUMN, PAGE 1 – Enter the sum of Columns on Pages 1 and 2.

ITEM 10. STATUS OF FUNDS. Round all figures to the nearest dollar.

LINE a. Enter the total outlays reported on Line 10e of the last report. Show zero if this is the initial report.

LINE b. Enter the total gross program outlays for this report period, including disbursements of cash realized as program income. For reports which are prepared on a cash basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements for goods and services, the amount of indirect expense charged, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the amount of cash advances and payments made to contractors and subgrantees. For reports prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursement, the amount of indirect expense incurred, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the net increase (or decrease) in the amounts owed by the grantee for goods and other property received.

LINE c. Enter the amount of all program income realized in this period which is to be used in the project or program in accordance with the terms of the grant. For reports prepared on a cash basis, enter the amount of cash income received during the reporting period. For reports prepared on an accrual basis, enter the amount of the net increase (or decrease) in the amount of accrued income since the beginning of the report period.

LINE d. This amount should be the difference between amounts shown on Lines b and c.

LINE e. Enter "NA".

LINE f. Enter the amount pertaining to the non-Federal share of program outlays included in the amount on Line d.

LINE g. Enter the Federal share of program outlays. The amount should be the difference between Lines d and f.

LINE h. When the report is prepared on a cash basis, enter the total amount of unpaid obligations for this project or program including unpaid obligations to subgrantees. If the report is prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, enter the amount of undelivered orders and other outstanding obligations. Do not include any amounts that have been included on Lines a through g. On the final report, Line h should have a zero balance.

LINE i. Enter the non-Federal share of unpaid obligations shown on Line h.

LINE j. Enter the Federal share of unpaid obligations shown on Line h. The amount shown on this line should be the difference between the amounts on Lines h and i.

LINE k. Enter the sum of the amounts shown on Lines g and j. If the report is final, the report should not contain any unpaid obligations.

LINE l. Enter the total cumulative amount of Federal funds authorized (the allotments). Enter under Columns (6) and Total only.

LINE m. Enter the unobligated balance of Federal funds. This amount should be the difference between Lines k and l. Make entries in Columns (6) and Total only.

ITEM 11. – INDIRECT EXPENSE

a. Type of Rate – Mark the appropriate box.

b. Rate – Enter the rate in effect during the reporting period.

c. Base – Enter the amount of the base in which the rate was applied.

d. Total Amount – Enter the total amount of indirect cost charged during the report period. Do not claim indirect costs from carry-over funds during the same year claims for indirect costs are made against funds allotted for that fiscal year.

e. Federal Share – Enter the amount of the Federal share charged during the report period. If indirect costs are charged against NDEA Title III administrative funds, matching State funds must be reported on this line.

If more than one rate was applied during the project period, include a separate schedule which shows the bases against which the indirect cost rates were applied, the respective indirect rates, the month, day and year, the indirect rates were in effect, amounts of indirect expense charges to the project to date. (See Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87 which contains principles for determining allowable costs of grants and contracts with State and local governments.)

ITEM 12. – Space is provided for any explanation deemed necessary by the grantee.

ITEM 13. Complete the certification before submitting this report. The authorized official is designated in the State plan as the one to submit official materials.

OE FORM 1200, 5/7

OMB NO. 29-R0224

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

1. FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT
U.S. Office of Education/Office of Libraries and Learning Resources

2. FEDERAL GRANT NO. OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NO.
NDEA III, FY 7 CAN: 62001962: 62001964

3. NAME AND ADDRESS OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATION

4. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.

5. GRANTEE ACCOUNT NO. OR IDENTIFYING NO.

6. FINAL REPORT
☐ YES
☐ NO

7. BASIS OF REPORT
☐ CASH
☐ ACCRUED EXPENDITURES

8. PROJECT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year)
FROM 7 | 1 | 75 TO 9 | 30 | 76

9. REPORT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year)
FROM 7 | 1 | 75 TO 9 | 30 | 76

10. STATUS OF FUNDS	PROGRAMS - FUNCTIONS - ACTIVITIES						
	(1) Natural Sciences	(2) Mathematics	(3) Modern Foreign Languages	(4) Social Sciences	(5) English and Reading	(6) Administration	TOTAL
a. Total outlays previously reported							
b. Total program outlays this period							
c. LESS: Program income credits							
d. Net program outlays this period							
e. Total program outlays to date							
f. LESS: Non-Federal share of program outlays							
g. Total Federal share of program outlays							
h. Total unpaid obligations							
i. LESS: Non-Federal share of unpaid obligations							
j. Federal share of unpaid obligations							
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unpaid obligations							
l. Total Federal funds authorized							
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds							

11. INDIRECT EXPENSE: a. TYPE OF RATE (Mark box)
☐ PROVISIONAL ☐ FINAL
☐ PREDETERMINED ☐ FIXED

b. RATE

c. BASE

d. TOTAL AMOUNT

e. FEDERAL SHARE

12. REMARKS (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

13. Certification - I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purpose set forth in the grant award documents.

NAME	TITLE	TELEPHONE		
		AREA CODE	NUMBER	EXT.
SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL			DATE REPORT IS SUBMITTED	

HEW-601T

OMB NO. 29-R0224

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

1. FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT
U.S. Office of Education/Office of Libraries and Learning Resources

2. FEDERAL GRANT NO. OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NO.
NDEA III FY 7 CAN: 62001962

3. NAME AND ADDRESS OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATION

4. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.

5. GRANTEE ACCOUNT NO. OR IDENTIFYING NO.

6. FINAL REPORT
☐ YES
☐ NO

7. BASIS OF REPORT
☐ CASH
☐ ACCRUED EXPENDITURES

8. PROJECT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year)
FROM 7 | 1 | 75 TO 9 | 30 | 76

9. REPORT PERIOD (Month, Day, Year)
FROM 7 | 1 | 75 TO 9 | 30 | 76

10. STATUS OF FUNDS	PROGRAMS - FUNCTIONS - ACTIVITIES						
	(1) Arts and Humanities	(2) Industrial Arts	(3) Audiovisual Libraries	(4) Minor Remodeling	(5)	(6)	TOTAL
a. Total outlays previously reported							
b. Total program outlays this period							
c. LESS: Program income credits							
d. Net program outlays this period							
e. Total program outlays to date							
f. LESS: Non-Federal share of program outlays							
g. Total Federal share of program outlays							
h. Total unpaid obligations							
i. LESS: Non-Federal share of unpaid obligations							
j. Federal share of unpaid obligations							
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unpaid obligations							
l. Total Federal funds authorized							
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds							

11. INDIRECT EXPENSE: a. TYPE OF RATE (Mark box)
☐ PROVISIONAL ☐ FINAL
☐ PREDETERMINED ☐ FIXED

b. RATE

c. BASE

d. TOTAL AMOUNT

e. FEDERAL SHARE

12. REMARKS (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

13. Certification - I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purpose set forth in the grant award documents.

NAME

TITLE

TELEPHONE
AREA CODE
NUMBER
EXT.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

DATE REPORT IS SUBMITTED

EW-601T

TABLES

Table 1. Federal and State funds expended and State Administration of NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1973

	Allotment for State Administration	Federal	Expenditures State and Local	Total	Federal Amount as Percent of Allotment	Federal Amount as Percent of total	Carryover Federal
TOTALS	$ 2,000,000	$ 1,587,108	$ 2,112,715	$ 3,699,823	79.4	42.9	(416,892)
Alabama	33,703	33,703	33,703	67,406	100.0	50.0	-0-
Alaska	13,333	8,950	8,950	17,900	67.1	50.0	4,383
Arizona	17,221	17,221	17,221	34,442	100.0	50.0	-0-
Arkansas	18,419	15,852	15,852	31,704	86.0	50.0	2,567
California	175,946	175,946	175,946	351,892	100.0	50.0	-0-
Colorado	20,109	20,109	20,938	41,047	100.0	50.0	5,540
Connecticut	26,519	20,979	20,979	41,958	79.1	50.0	5,046
Deleware	13,333	8,287	22,529	30,816	62.1	26.9	50,018
District of Columbia	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,660	100.0	50.0	44,409
Florida	56,136	6,118	6,118	12,236	10.9	50.0	-0-
Georgia	44,409	-0-	- 0 -	-0 -	0.0	0.0	-0-
Hawaii	13,333	13,333	14,571	27,904	100.0	47.7	8,124
Idaho	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	50.0	-0-
Illinois	100,264	92,140	92,140	184,280	91.9	50.0	-0-
Indiana	48,142	48,142	74,043	122,185	100.0	39.4	578
Iowa	26,237	26,237	26,237	52,474	100.0	50.0	3,702
Kansas	21,483	20,905	20,905	41,810	97.3	50.0	32,381
Kentucky	30,040	26,338	26,339	52,677	87.6	50.0	-0-
Louisiana	37,333	407	409	814	10.8	50.0	-0-
Maine	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	50.0	7,362
Maryland	35,464	35,464	35,464	70,928	100.0	50.0	1,374
Massachusetts	47,755	40,393	40,393	80,786	84.5	50.0	24,696
Michigan	85,402	84,028	106,224	190,252	98.4	44.1	7,246
Minnesota	36,309	11,613	25,270	36,883	31.9	31.5	-0-
Mississippi	23,948	16,702	16,702	33,404	69.7	50.0	26
Missouri	41,873	41,873	41,873	83,746	100.0	50.0	6,753
Montana	13,333	13,307	13,307	26,614	99.8	50.0	102
Nebraska	13,629	8,076	8,737	16,813	59.2	48.0	-0-
Nevada	13,333	6,580	6,580	13,160	49.3	50.0	10,974
New Hampshire	13,333	13,231	13,230	26,461	99.2	50.0	36,874
New Jersey	62,475	62,475	172,823	235,298	100.0	26.5	2,550
New Mexico	13,333	2,359	2,358	4,717	17.7	50.0	-0-
New York	154,533	117,659	117,659	235,318	76.1	50.0	95,205
North Carolina	48,212	45,662	45,662	91,324	94.7	50.0	1,591
North Dakota	13,333	13,333	13,330	26,666	100.0	50.0	[illegible]
Ohio	100,545	5,340	99,116	104,456	5.3	5.1	95,205
Oklahoma	22,539	20,948	20,974	41,922	92.9	49.9	1,591
Oregon	18,243	18,243	18,243	36,486	100.0	50.0	-0-
Pennsylvania	101,813	100,552	100,552	201,104	98.7	50.0	1,261
Rhode Island	13,333	7,838	7,838	15,676	58.8	50.0	5,495
South Carolina	26,695	26,695	26,695	53,390	100.0	50.0	-0-
South Dakota	13,333	3,247	4,200	7,447	24.3	43.6	10,086
Tennessee	36,027	36,027	227,057	313,084	100.0	11.5	-0-
Texas	109,737	90,054	90,054	180,108	82.0	50.0	19,683
Utah	13,333	12,302	12,302	24,604	92.2	50.0	1,031
Vermont	13,333	9,515	9,515	19,030	71.3	50.0	3,818
Virginia	42,930	42,799	42,799	85,598	99.7	50.0	131
Washington	30,639	30,639	30,639	61,278	100.0	50.0	-0-
West Virginia	15,953	15,953	15,953	31,906	100.0	50.0	-0-
Wisconsin	40,535	40,535	41,286	81,821	100.0	49.5	-0-
Wyoming	13,333	-0-	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	13,333
American Samoa	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Guam	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Puerto Rico	19,000	19,000	19,000	38,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Virgin Islands	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-	-	-0-

Table 2. Federal and State funds expended and State administration of NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974

	Allotment for State Administration	Expenditures			Federal Amount as Percent of Allotment	Federal Amount as Percent of Total	Federal Amount Carryover
		Federal Amount	State and Local Amount	Total Administration			
TOTALS	$ 2,000,000	$ 1,331,990	$ 1,799,226	$ 3,131,216	66.6	42.5	668,010
Alabama	32,838	32,838	32,838	65,676	100.0	50.0	-0-
Alaska	13,333	239	239	478	1.8	50.0	13,094
Arizona *	17,698	17,698	17,698	35,697	100.0	50.0	-0-
Arkansas	17,521	5,981	5,981	11,962	34.1	50.0	11,540
California *	176,876	176,876	176,876	353,752	100.0	50.0	-0-
Colorado	21,039	3,679	4,785	8,464	17.5	43.4	17,360
Connecticut	27,293	20,164	20,164	40,328	73.8	50.0	7,129
Deleware	13,333	-0-	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	13,333
District of Columbia*	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	50.0	-0-
Florida	57,751	25,197	25,196	50,393	43.6	50.0	32,554
Georgia	43,464	15,519	15,519	31,038	100.0	50.0	27,945
Hawaii	13,333	13,333	23,078	36,411	100.0	36.6	-0-
Idaho *	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	50.0	-0-
Illinois *	100,788	91,873	91,873	183,746	91.1	50.0	8,915
Indiana	48,688	48,688	71,666	120,354	100.0	40.4	-0-
Iowa	26,193	26,193	26,193	52,386	100.0	50.0	-0-
Kansas	19,866	19,866	19,866	39,732	100.0	50.0	--0-
Kentucky	29,888	16,151	16,151	32,302	54.0	50.0	13,737
Louisiana *	36,818	36,796	36,796	73,592	99.9	99.9	22
Maine *	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	100.0	-0-
Maryland *	37,209	37,209	37,209	74,418	100.0	100.0	-0-
Massachusetts	50,110	-0-	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	50,110
Michigan	86,360	50,426	60,551	110,977	58.4	58.4	35,934
Minnesota	37,031	2,595	26,921	29,516	7.0	7.0	34,436
Mississippi	22,390	16,767	16,766	33,533	74.9	74.9	5,623
Missouri	41,545	41,545	41,545	83,090	100.0	100.0	-0-
Montana	13,333	558	2,410	2,968	4.2	4.2	12,775
Nebraska	13,718	96	-0-	96	0.7	0.7	13,622
Nevada	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	100.0	-0-
New Hampshire	13,333	5,259	5,258	10,517	39.4	39.4	8,074
New Jersey	64,397	55,302	156,872	212,040	85.9	85.9	9,095
New Mexico	13,333	-0-	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	13,333
New York	154,381	115,872	115,872	231,744	75.0	75.0	38,509
North Carolina	46,627	6,028	6,028	12,056	12.9	12.9	40,599
North Dakota *	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	50.0	-0-
Ohio	98,798	-0-	101,444	101,444	0.0	0.0	98,798
Oklahoma	22,496	15,077	15,142	30,219	67.0	49.9	7,419
Oregon	18,880	18,800	18,800	37,600	100.0	50.0	-0-
Pennsylvania	102,849	101,300	101,300	202,600	98.5	50.0	1,549
Rhode Island	13,333	6,946	6,946	13,892	52.1	50.0	6,387
South Carolina	25,269	25,269	23,269	50,538	100.0	50.0	-0-
South Dakota	13,333	-0-	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	13,333
Tennessee	35,503	35,503	220,940	256,443	100.0	13.8	-0-
Texas	106,118	16,542	16,542	33,084	15.6	50.0	89,576
Utah	13,333	1,063	1,063	2,126	50.0	50.0	12,270
Vermont	13,333	13,333	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	13,333
Virginia	42,539	29,528	29,528	59,056	69.4	50.0	13,011
Washington *	30,812	30,812	30,812	61,624	100.0	50.0	-0-
West Virginia	15,495	15,495	15,495	30,990	100.0	50.0	-0-
Wisconsin	42,504	42,504	42,504	85,008	100.0	50.0	-0-
Wyoming *	13,333	13,333	13,333	26,666	100.0	50.0	-0-
American Samoa	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Trust Territories of the Pacific Is.	4,000 4,000	1,655	1,655	3,310	100.0	50.0	2,345
Guam	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Puerto Rico	19,000	16,750	25,571	42,321	88.1	39.6	2,250
Virgin Islands	4,000	4,000	4,000	8,000	100.0	50.0	-0-
Bureau of Indian Aff.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Estimated

Table 3. **Number of State Educational Agency Personnel Assigned to NEDA Title III Administration in Full-time Equivalents: Fiscal Year 1973**

State or other area	Administrators	Supervisor	Secretarial and Clerical	Other	Total
	37.5	74.9	109.7	17.5	239.6
Alabama	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.5
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.5
Arkansas	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.5
California	2.0	4.8	7.7	0.0	14.5
Colorado	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.5
Connecticut	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.0	2.9
Delaware	1.0	4.0	2.0	1.0	8.0
Florida	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.0	4.5
Georgia	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Hawaii	0.1	1.7	0.5	0.0	2.3
Idaho	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Illinois	1.0	1.0	17.0	0.0	19.0
Indiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Iowa	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
Kansas	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	2.0
Kentucky	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Maine	0.5	2.8	2.0	1.0	6.3
Maryland	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Massachusetts	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Michigan	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Minnesota	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.5
Mississippi	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
Missouri	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Montana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Nebraska	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.4
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
New Jersey	1.0	1.3	3.0	0.2	5.5
New Mexico	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5
New York	2.0	0.0	8.0	1.0	11.0
North Carolina	2.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	7.0
North Dakota	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.3
Ohio	0.7	0.1	1.1	1.8	3.7
Oklahoma	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.0	1.0
Oregon	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.2	2.2
Pennsylvania	1.0	10.0	13.0	8.0	32.0
Rhode Island	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	1.0
South Carolina	0.0	1.3	0.5	0.0	1.8
South Dakota	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8
Tennessee	0.3	4.0	2.6	0.0	6.8
Texas	1.0	7.1	6.6	3.0	17.7
Utah	0.3	0.8	1.1	0.0	2.2
Vermont	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.0	1.9
Virginia	0.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Washington	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.5	2.2
West Virginia	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.2
Wisconsin	0.5	10.0	3.0	0.3	13.8
Wyoming	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.0	1.1
American Samoa	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.8
Trust Territory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	1.0	7.0	2.0	0.0	10.0
Guam	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	2.0
Puerto Rico	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Virgin Islands	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.0
Bur. of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 4. Number of State Educational Agency Personnel assigned to NDEA Title III Administration in full-time equivalents: Fiscal Year 1974

State or Other Area	Administrators	Supervisor	Secretarial and Clerical	Other	Total
	32.9	69.0	98.3	17.0	217.2
* Alabama	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.5
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.5
Arkansas	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
California	1.0	3.7	6.2	0.0	10.9
* Colorado	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.5
Connecticut	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.0	2.9
Delaware	1.0	4.0	2.0	1.0	8.0
Florida	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.0	4.5
Georgia	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Hawaii	0.1	1.7	0.5	0.0	2.3
Idaho	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	11.0
Indiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
* Iowa	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.0
* Kansas	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	2.0
Kentucky	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Maine	0.5	2.8	2.0	1.0	6.3
Maryland	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Massachusetts	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Michigan	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Minnesota	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.5
Mississippi	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
Missouri	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Nebraska	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
New Jersey	1.0	1.0	3.0	0.2	1.0
New Mexico	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.5
New York	2.0	0.0	8.0	1.0	11.0
North Carolina	0.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.5
North Dakota	1.1	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.3
Ohio	0.7	0.1	1.1	1.8	3.7
Oklahoma	.2	0.1	.7	0.0	1.0
Oregon	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.2	2.2
Pennsylvania	1.0	10.0	13.0	8.0	32.0
Rhode Island	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	1.0
South Carolina	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.0	1.2
South Dakota	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8
Tennessee	0.2	3.9	2.6	0.0	6.7
Texas	1.0	7.1	6.6	2.9	17.6
Utah	0.3	0.6	1.5	0.0	2.4
Vermont	0.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Virginia	0.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Washington	0.5	.2	1.0	0.1	1.8
West Virginia	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.2
Wisconsin	0.5	10.0	3.0	0.3	13.8
Wyoming	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.0	1.0
American Samoa	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.7
* Trust Territory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	1.0	7.0	2.0	0.0	10.0
* Guam	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	2.0
Puerto Rico	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Virgin Islands	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.0
* Bur. of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

* Estimated

Table 5. Source of funds and percent of total expenditures for acquisition of equipment and materials, audiovisual libraries, and minor remodeling under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1973.

State and other Areas	Total Allotment	Total Expenditures	Federal Expenditures		Percent Total	State and Local Expenditures		Federal Amount Carried Over
			Expenditures	Percent Allotment		Expenditures	Percent Total	
Total	$47,750,000	$63,705,484	$30,762,208	64.4	48.3	$32,943,276	51.7	$16,987,792
Alabama	1,116,105	2,232,191	1,116,095	99.9	50.0	1,116,096	50.0	10
Alaska	78,121	121,950	60,975	78.0	50.0	60,975	50.0	17,146
Arizona *	519,524	1,039,048	519,524	100.0	50.0	519,524	50.0	- 0 -
Arkansas	586,698	1,080,416	540,208	92.1	50.0	540,208	50.0	46,490
California *	3,633,244	7,266,488	3,633,244	100.0	50.0	3,633,244	50.0	- 0 -
Colorado	562,833	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	562,833
Connecticut	477,280	968,180	477,280	100.0	49.3	490,900	50.7	- 0 -
Delaware	122,422	244,844	122,422	100.0	50.0	122,422	50.0	- 0 -
District of Columbia *	98,354	196,708	98,354	100.0	50.0	98,354	50.0	- 0 -
Florida	1,502,741	1,874,506	937,252	62.4	50.0	937,254	50.0	565,489
Georgia *	1,340,845	2,681,692	1,340,845	100.0	50.0	1,340,847	50.0	- 0 -
Hawaii	193,274	742,163	193,274	100.0	26.0	548,889	74.0	- 0 -
Idaho *	226,693	453,386	226,693	100.0	50.0	226,693	50.0	- 0 -
Illinois *	2,057,975	1,142,084	475,344	23.1	41.6	666,740	58.4	1,582,631
Indiana	1,261,778	2,523,556	1,261,778	100.0	50.0	1,261,778	50.0	- 0 -
Iowa	682,180	864,095	432,047	63.3	50.0	432,048	50.0	250,133
Kansas	537,646	1,075,202	537,601	99.9	50.0	537,601	50.0	45
Kentucky	939,617	1,674,014	837,007	89.1	50.0	837,007	50.0	102,610
Louisiana *	1,212,386	2,424,772	1,212,386	100.0	50.0	1,212,386	50.0	- 0 -
Maine	271,690	118,149	59,074	21.7	50.0	59,075	50.0	212,616
Maryland *	867,928	1,735,856	867,928	100.0	50.0	867,928	50.0	- 0 -
Massachusetts	1,023,832	1,836,570	918,285	89.7	50.0	918,285	50.0	105,547
Michigan	2,163,491	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	2,163,491
Minnesota	1,019,153	2,150,081	1,019,153	100.0	47.4	1,130,928	53.0	- 0 -
Mississippi	759,034	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	759,034
Missouri	1,077,378	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	1,077,378
Montana	210,074	577,091	210,074	100.0	36.4	367,017	63.6	- 0 -
Nebraska	363,104	769,780	363,104	100.0	47.1	406,676	52.9	- 0 -
Nevada *	95,440	190,880	95,440	100.0	50.0	95,440	50.0	- 0 -
New Hampshire	173,083	318,098	159,049	91.9	50.0	159,049	50.0	14,034
New Jersey	1,240,453	397,999	198,860	16.0	49.9	199,139	50.0	1,041,593
New Mexico	370,513	752,751	369,828	99.8	49.1	382,923	50.9	685
New York	2,670,488	5,340,976	2,670,488	100.0	50.0	2,670,488	50.0	- 0 -
North Carolina	1,478,010	2,956,020	1,478,010	100.0	50.0	1,478,010	50.0	- 0 -
North Dakota	198,037	54,618	27,309	13.8	50.0	27,309	50.0	170,728
Ohio	2,544,565	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	2,544,565
Oklahoma	646,685	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	646,685
Oregon	482,161	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	482,161
Pennsylvania *	2,475,420	4,950,840	2,475,420	100.0	50.0	2,475,840	50.0	- 0 -
Rhode Island	173,359	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	173,359
South Carolina	861,056	2,161,653	721,906	83.8	33.4	1,439,747	66.6	139,150
South Dakota	206,092	372,671	153,398	74.4	41.1	219,273	58.9	52,694
Tennessee	1,113,639	1,076,025	538,012	48.2	50.0	538,013	50.0	575,627
Texas	3,147,850	1,269,772	634,886	20.1	50.0	634,886	50.0	2,512,964
Utah	363,078	1,177,672	363,078	100.0	30.8	814,594	69.2	- 0 -
Vermont	117,336	234,672	117,336	100.0	50.0	117,336	50.0	- 0 -
Virginia	1,198,225	217,143	108,550	9.1	49.9	108,593	50.1	1,089,675
Washington	729,965	1,459,930	729,965	100.0	50.0	729,965	50.0	- 0 -
West Virginia	501,406	916,658	458,329	91.4	50.0	458,329	50.0	43,077
Wisconsin	1,128,261	2,284,162	1,128,262	100.0	49.4	1,155,901	50.6	- 0 -
Wyoming	93,853	182,402	88,511	94.3	48.5	93,891	51.5	5,342
Bur. of Indians Affairs	50,000	100,000	50,000	100.0	50.0	100,000	50.0	- 0 -
American Samoa	50,000	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	50,000
Guam	50,000	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0	0.0	- 0 -	0.0	50,000
Puerto Rico	585,625	1,197,720	585,625	100.0	48.9	612,095	51.1	- 0 -
Trust Territories * of the Pacific Islands	50,000	100,000 100,000	50,000 50,000	100.0 100.0	50.0 50.0	50,000 50,000	50.0	- 0 -
Virgin Islands *	50,000	100,000	50,000	100.0	50.0	50,000	50.0	- 0 -

* Estimated

Table 6. Source of funds and percent of total expenditures for acquisition of equipment and materials, audiovisual libraries, and minor remodeling under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974

STATE AND OTHER AREA	Allotment	Total Expenditures	FEDERAL EXPENDITURES			STATE AND LOCAL EXPENDITURES		Federal Amount Carried Over
			Expenditures	Percent of Allotment	Percent of Total	Expenditures	Percent of Total	
TOTALS	$26,250,000	$31,400,941	$51,029,673	57.0	47.8	$16,371,268	52.1	$11,220,327
Alabama	601,040	515,516	257,758	42.9	50.0	257,758	50.0	343,282
Alaska	46,093	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Arizona	283,906	567,812	283,906	100.0	50.0	283,906	50.0	-0-
Arkansas	316,892	633,784	316,892	100.0	50.0	316,892	50.0	-0-
California	2,022,468	4,044,936	2,022,468	100.0	50.0	2,022,468	50.0	-0-
Colorado	308,533	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	308,533
Connecticut	273,152	547,207	273,152	100.0	49.9	274,055	50.1	-0-
Delaware	68,425	110,286	55,143	80.6	50.0	55,143	50.0	-0-
Dist. of Col.	53,585	107,170	53,585	100.0	50.0	53,585	50.0	-0-
Florida	801,383	527,030	263,515	32.9	50.0	263,515	50.0	20,404
Georgia	719,417	1,398,026	699,013	97.1	50.0	699,013	50.0	-0-
Hawaii	100,573	273,764	100,573	100.0	36.7	173.191	63.3	-0-
Idaho	123,586	247,172	123,586	100.0	50.0	123,586	50.0	-0-
Illinois	1,170,627	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,170,627
Indiana	698,869	1,397,738	1,397,738	100.0	50.0	698,869	50.0	
Iowa	383,739	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	383,739
Kansas	284,277	552,210	276,105	97.1	50.0	276,105	50.0	8,172
Kentucky	510,055	392,155	196,077	38.4	50.0	196.078	50.0	313,978
Louisiana	665,617	1,330,872	665,436	99.9	50.0	665,436	50.0	181
Maine	151,626	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	151,626
Maryland	478,438	956,876	478,438	100.0	50.0	478,438	50.0	-0-
Massachusetts	571,303	1,121,702	560,851	98.1	50.0	560,851	50.0	10,452
Michigan	1,173,929	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,173,929
Minnesota	555,186	920,410	428,546	77.1	46.6	491,864	53.4	126,640
Mississippi	414,274	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	414,274
Missouri	593,798	1,151,400	575,700	96.9	50.0	575,700	50.0	18,098
Montana	115,822	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	115,822
Nebraska	199,992	660,421	199,992	100.0	30.2	460,429	69.8	-0-
Nevada	54,435	108,870	54,435	100.0	50.0	54,435	50.0	-0-
New Hampshire	99,440	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	99,440
New Jersey	704,875	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	704,875
New Mexico	203,849	416,004	203,849	100.0	49.0	212,155	51.0	-0-
New York	1,487,171	1,924,342	962,171	64.7	50.0	962,171	50.0	525,000
North Carolina	786,782	1,573,564	786,782	100.0	50.0	786,782	50.0	-0-
North Dakota	108,710	227,648	68,710	47.8		118,938	52.2	1,379,208
Ohio	1,379,208	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Oklahoma	352,439	700,998	350,499	100.0	50.0	350,499	50.0	1,940
Oregon	266,046	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	266,046
Pennsylvania	1,354,415	2,708,830	1,354,415	100.0	50.0	1,354,415	50.0	-0-
Rhode Island	98,994	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	98,994
South Carolina	367,538	1,237,092	301,913	64.6	24.4	935,179	75.6	165,625
South Dakota	113,209	200.112	79,794	70,4	39.9	120,318	60.1	33,415
Tennessee	601,447	523,881	261,940	43.5	50.0	261,941	50.0	339,507
Texas	1,691,985	371,736	185,868	11.0	50.0	185,868	50.0	1,506,117
Utah	199,440	600,919	199,440	100.0	33.2	401,479	66.8	-0-
Vermont	65,432	22,350	11,175	17.1	50.0	11,175	50.0	54,257
Virginia	644,974	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	644,974
Washington	407,302	814,604	407,320	100.0	50.0	407,302	50.0	-0-
West Virginia	266,922	109,664	54,832	20.5	50.0	54,832	50.0	212,090
Wisconsin	632,756	1,265,512	632,756	100.0	50.0	632,756	50.0	-0-
Wyoming	51,026	102,052	51,026	100.0	50.0	51,026	50.0	-0-
American Samoa	25,000	-0-	-0-	0.0	0.0	-0-	0.0	212,090
Guam	25,000	50,005	25,000	100.0	50.0	25,005	50.0	-0-
Puerto Rico	937,756	831,783	390,917	98.3	47.0	440,866	53.0	6,839
Trust Territory	25,000	50,000	25,000	100.0	50.0	25,000	50.0	-0-
Virgin Islands	25,000	50,000	25,000	100.0	50.0	25,000	50.0	-0-
Bur. Ind Affairs	27,244	54,488	27,244	100.0	50.0	27,244	50.0	-0-

TABLE 7. Federal and State Expenditures for Materials and Equipment in Seven Academic Subject Areas and for Audiovisual Libraries and Minor Remodeling Under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1973

SUBJECT OR OTHER AREA (1)	COST (2)	PERCENT OF TOTAL (3)
Natural Science	$ 15,131,183	23.7
Mathematics	4,877,664	7.6
Modern Foreign Languages	5,321,863	8.3
Social Sciences	6,039,656	9.5
English and Reading	18,262,250	28.7
Arts and Humanities	5,478,085	8.6
Industrial Arts	5,417,744	8.5
Audiovisual Libraries	2,772,111	4.3
Minor Remodeling	404,928	0.6
TOTAL	$ 63,705,484	100.0

TABLE 8. Federal and State Expenditures for Materials and Equipment in Seven Academic Subject Areas and for Audiovisual Libraries and Minor Remodeling Under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974

SUBJECT OR OTHER AREA	COST	PERCENT OF TOTAL
(1)	(2)	(3)
Natural Science	$ 6,534,458	20.8
Mathematics	2,478,823	7.9
Modern Foreign Languages	2,185,145	7.0
Social Sciences	3,247,705	10.3
English and Reading	8,842,385	28.2
Arts and Humanities	3,244,839	10.3
Industrial Arts	3,267,462	10.4
Audiovisual Libraries	1,310,827	4.2
Minor Remodeling	284,297	0.9
TOTAL	$ 31,395,941	100.0

TABLE 9. Loans to Private Nonprofit Schools Under NDEA Title III: Fiscal Year 1974

STATE (1)	CITY (2)	SCHOOL (3)	AMOUNT (4)
California	Van Nuys	Montclair School	$27,640
Louisiana	New Orleans	Mount Carmel Academy	31,300
Maine	Hollis	Salmon Falls School	10,900
Maryland	Silver Spring	Washington Christian	2,000
New York	Lawrence	The Brandeis School	12,000
New York	Spring Valley	Soloman Schechter	2,900
TOTAL			$86,740

TABLE 10. Use of Loans Under NDEA Title III, Title III: Fiscal Year 1974

SUBJECT	AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
(1)	(2)	(3)
Science	$24,100	27.8
Mathematics	4,591	5.3
Modern Foreign Languages	5,599	6.2
History, Geography, Civics and Economic English	6,600	7.7
Reading	5,038	5.8
Industrial Arts	3,000	3.5
Arts and Humanities	4,370	5.1
Audiovisual Equipment and Materials (all subject areas)	28,129	32.5
	$86,740	100.0